

The Forum

DECEMBER, 1898.

THE DOCTRINE OF INTERVENTION.

THE swift current of unforeseen events has brought us to the juncture when we must decide what our position shall be among the nations of the world.

We have hitherto held aloof from foreign affairs. The Cretan Question found us indifferent. When the partition of China was begun we did not raise our voice. With the ideas prevailing among us at that time, the whole of China might have been divided between Germany, England, Russia, and France, and we should have remained dumb. We were bound hand and foot by a misconception of Washington's Farewell Address. It mattered not that the most populous country in the world was opening its doors to our commerce. It mattered not that our merchants and manufacturers were beginning to seize the trade of *our own sea*, the Pacific,—*our sea* that washes our coast and the coast of Asia, and brings the Orient nearer to us, by many days and miles, than it is to Europe. Japan had welcomed foreign civilization. Korea was building railroads. China was recovering from her depression. She was gridironing her soil with steel rails, opening up rivers in the interior to steam navigation, establishing universities, and decreeing reforms.

We have treaties with China which guarantee to us the same treatment that is accorded to the most-favored nation. We stood by and saw Germany, Russia, and France seize portions of China. England and Japan also stood by silent. But Japan had already seized Formosa; and at the last, England, not to be outdone by her neighbors, seized Wei-

Copyright, 1897, by The Forum Publishing Company.
Permission to republish articles is reserved.

hai-wei together with some two hundred miles of islands and mainland around Hong Kong.

We did nothing. We neither seized lands nor protested. We were "Non-Interventionists." We had a commerce of thirty millions of dollars at stake, and the prospect of unlimited traffic. The greatest commercial sphere, which was ours by natural right, seemed about to be closed to us. China was the camping-ground of hostile armies; but our soldiers found no bivouac there. China was the El Dorado of the manufacturer; but the manufactured goods were to come from other lands than ours.

Then came Dewey's victory. In the twinkling of an eye, in the firing of a gun, as it were, the conditions were changed. We found ourselves possessed of an empire in the East greater by far than the recent combined annexations of the Continental Powers in China. We had forborne to rob China; but we had conquered—in fair, open, honorable war—the Philippines. Hand to hand, and gun to gun, we had won the battle; and the law of nations gave to us the best title by which a nation can hold territory—that of conquest.

The spectre of Non-Intervention rises here to warn us of untold evils. We are informed that we have no right to hold a people in subjection; and this, it is said, is taught by the Declaration of Independence. The answer is simple and conclusive. We do not propose to hold any people in subjection. On the contrary, we do propose to enfranchise every people which comes under our control. Our government of the Philippines would be absolute freedom compared with that of Spain. Local self-government would soon take the place of the former despotism; education would take the place of ignorance; civilization, of barbarism.

We annexed the Hawaiian Islands because the time had come when we were compelled to assert our proper, natural, and legitimate influence in the affairs of the world. Those islands are a stepping-stone to the Far East. If there were no Asiatic continent three thousand five hundred miles away, and no Australia lying to the south, we should never have thought of annexing the Hawaiian Islands. We must annex the Philippines for the same reason. They furnish us with a foothold by means of which we can assert our proper influence in Eastern affairs; and their possession will benefit our trade and commerce.

I have been told that this is a sordid view to take; that a government should engage itself in the effort to elevate man; that not commerce, but man, is king. With all proper respect for humanitarians, I must insist that the main object of government is to increase the *material*

well-being of its people. Unless it does this, it is worse than useless. The French king who expressed the wish that government might be so administered that every peasant could have a pullet to boil on Sunday, has passed into history as the wisest of French rulers.

I venture to assert that any citizen of the United States who, by some wise suggestion, should reduce the taxes of his city 25 per cent, would be elected mayor at the next election. Nor would it necessarily follow from such reduction that interests not purely utilitarian would be neglected. So, any Administration which will materially increase commerce will receive solid popular approval.

Let me speak plainly. I do not write for political purposes. With the protective tariff now in force, we must have foreign markets for our goods. We cannot sell at home all that we manufacture. Because our manufacturers can sell their goods at home free of competition, they are enabled to sell them abroad at lower prices than those prevailing at home. The course of trade in China has demonstrated this condition.

When the Mexican dollar came to be worth but forty-two cents, as it did at Shanghai, it was apparent that the export trade would go up by leaps and bounds. When a man can buy native products for silver and sell them for gold, it is plain that he will buy extensively. On this account, the export trade of China increased enormously. The problem was, What will happen to the import trade when goods are bought for gold and have to be sold for silver? If prices should be doubled there would be a falling-off in sales. The fact was that the import trade also increased, though not in the proportion that the export did. Our manufacturers held the market; and they still hold it. They lowered their prices; but they sold their goods.

Here it is worthy of note that our export trade has been, and still is, largely increasing. I have seen it stated that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, our exports exceeded \$1,230,000,000,—an increase over 1897 of nearly \$100,000,000. I care not what party may reap the benefit of this large increase. The average American citizen will welcome our commercial expansion, though his party idols may be shattered. He will put his country above his party, and the well-being of the masses above the gain of petty official place for the political partisan.

Our trade with China is increasing day by day, and the Chinese naturally turn to us in matters of business; and if not influenced by the other Powers, they would consult us on all important questions. When Sheng Taotai was appointed Director-General of the Railroads of China, his first memorial to the Throne set forth, in distinct and able phraseol-

ogy, the justice and propriety of procuring Americans to build all the railways. I do not care to enter into the reason why Americans do not at this day control the building of every Chinese railroad. They have a contract, however, to construct eight hundred miles of road, from Hankow to Canton, which will pass through a population of two hundred millions. The passenger traffic alone of this railroad will pay dividends from the start.

China is developing her mines. An Italian syndicate has very valuable concessions for the opening up of mines in Shansi. American capital is invested in this syndicate. The trade with California and Oregon in flour and lumber is largely increasing. Denver sends mining-plants. The Baldwins and the Rogers are selling locomotives, and will sell hundreds. Our sheeting and coal oil find a splendid market in China. Shall this trade not be protected? Shall we deliberately give up the markets of the East, or shall we push them with all possible assistance from our Government?

If we enhance our dignity and influence in the East, we inevitably increase our trade. A powerful fleet on the Asiatic station helps us in many ways besides affording necessary protection to our citizens in the Far East. Such a fleet demands suitable stations where it may obtain coal, and where it may refit when necessary. Suppose that Dewey had been beaten at Manila, in what port could he have taken refuge? He was seven thousand miles distant from his own country; and under inexorable law the ports of every nation were closed to him. Such a contingency may well bid us pause and reflect on the possibilities of the future.

Dewey was ordered out of Hong Kong. He went to Mirs Bay. He had no more right in Mirs Bay, except for twenty-four hours, than he had at Hong Kong; but he was not the man to allow a technicality to stand between him and the doomed fleet of Spain. He waited and waited; holding his steamers like the dogs of war in leash. Then, when the news that war was declared reached him officially, he struck a blow which has resounded around the world.

Well do I remember when the veteran Chinese statesman Li Hung Chang heard of our victory at Manila, and how astonished he expressed himself to be, because he had always thought the Americans were a peaceful, commercial people: he did not know they were such fighters. Then, with the instinct of the diplomat and the statesman, he added that he was glad of the conquest of the Philippines, because the Americans would treat the Chinese fairly and kindly. It did not enter into the mind of

this veteran in statecraft that we should ever give up the islands. He went so far as to express the hope that a certain gentleman would be appointed Governor of the Philippines on account of his friendship for the person in question, and because he thought he would protect the Chinese.

In answer to the powerful demand for a larger commerce, for more extensive markets, for the assertion of our legitimate influence in the family of nations, we are told—or I, at least, have been told—by distinguished persons, that it is atrocious for us to intervene in the affairs of foreign nations, and that the policy of Expansion will inevitably lead to Intervention. Here I desire to say most emphatically that I yield to no one in admiration and approval of the general doctrine enunciated in Washington's Farewell Address. Certainly we should not intervene in the affairs of foreign nations when those affairs are peculiar to such foreign nations, and do not affect our own interests. Diplomacy takes no account of sentiment. We may sympathize with England; we may believe that blood is thicker than water; we may rave over the facts that we speak the same language, have in the main the same laws, literature, and religion; but all these considerations should not for a moment induce us to form an offensive and defensive alliance with England. Such intervention with England or Russia, or any other country, I should deplore. I do not want to take part in foreign wars; but I would proclaim it from the housetops that we should intervene in every case in which our material interests are involved.

If a hair of the head of an American citizen is wrongfully touched in a foreign country, we are all of accord in saying that immediate redress should be demanded. We agree that we will fight on such an issue. There can be no better cause of war; for, if a government does not protect its citizens, of what use is it? For what purpose are governments organized, except to secure to their people life, liberty, and the free pursuit of happiness?

Much as the so-called vagaries of the Emperor of Germany have been ridiculed, it must be admitted that his foreign policy has been wise. Wherever a German has been injured or oppressed, in his person or his property, ships have been sent to demand redress. Wherever the German eagle has set his claws, there he remains, and, according to a recent declaration of the Emperor, there he will remain. Are we weaker or more timid than Germany?

The protection afforded by a government cannot end with mere protection of the persons of its subjects. It must necessarily extend to the

rights of property as well. For instance, shall we stand by, silent, bound by the doctrine of Non-Intervention, and see America excluded from China? Shall we tacitly consent that China shall be closed to us? Shall we unprotestingly agree that one favored nation alone shall have the right to build railroads in China, or in any province thereof? Shall we deliberately announce to Europe, now aflame with the fire of colonization, that we have no interest in any disposition it may make of Siam, Korea, or China? It had been understood, up to the time of Dewey's victory, that that was our exact position, and that under no circumstances would we intervene in the affairs of any country outside of America. We went so far as to declare to the world that we were waging war against Spain for the simple purpose of freeing Cuba. Diplomats abroad looked with wonder at a war waged for such an unselfish purpose. Possibly, some of them may have believed that our alleged motives were sincere; but the majority of them understood perfectly well that we meant to annex Cuba.

When this question is presented to the American people, there will be but one voice on the subject; and that voice will be for annexation. That Cuba will be annexed, decently and sensibly, after due submission of the question to the people and their overwhelming vote in its favor, there can be no doubt. For more than fifty years the Cuban Question has been the *bête noire* of the United States. We have seen the flower of our youth slaughtered in Havana. We have seen our commerce disordered, our governmental expenses increased, our people kept at a tension of fear and distraction. War had to come. Fortunate is the President under whose Administration it came! Fortunate the President who brings peace and quietness to us, who bids this ghost of *Banquo* down forever! But his glory and honor will be obscured, and he will fall short of his splendid destiny, if he leaves his work undone; if (adapting Shakespeare's words), bound in shallows, he palters with us in a double sense, and keeps the word of promise to the ear, and breaks it to the hope. The nonsense of Quixotic warfare must be put behind us. We cannot pose as knight-errants. If we do, we shall have to fight the world.

Of course, I have no right to say one word for President McKinley, with whom I have barely the honor of acquaintance, but I venture the prediction that, at the proper time and in an honorable manner, Cuba will be annexed to the United States; and to this consummation I fervently cry, "Amen!"

Let us not imitate Japan, which fought a great war, with Korea as the

golden reward to the conqueror. There can be no doubt that at the beginning of that war Japan intended to annex Korea. If she did not, then the war had no *raison d'être*, but was simply an ebullition of silly spite. In the moment of military triumph, with China at her feet, Japan threw away the chance of centuries. Influenced by England, who wanted a buffer to Russia on the mainland, Japan declared—as we now declare that Cuba shall be free—that Korea should be released from the shadowy bond that held her to China, and that she (Japan) would take from Port Arthur to New-Chwang of the mainland. Of course, Russia would not permit this. She would not suffer a young, vigorous nationality to be interposed between her territory and the sea. She had no use for the policy of Non-Intervention. A hint to Japan was sufficient. She withdrew from the Liau Tong Peninsula, and contented herself with holding Formosa and the receipt of a reasonable indemnity.

Shall we repeat this historical blunder? From it have flowed all the ills of China. Because Germany got nothing from China, she helped herself to Kiao Chou and its vicinity. She has seized a part of the province which is sacred to China, as holding the tomb of Confucius. Russia and France then, in turn, demanded their pay for their intervention; and England, as she has always done, took what she would. No weak nation should ever ask a favor; no strong one ever needs to do so.

The misfortune of the United States is that we do not know our real greatness. We do not know our riches, our force, our actual influence in the affairs of the world. It is good to reside abroad. It is glorious to come back after a long absence. Under such conditions only can an American appreciate at its true value the country which is his home.

I may, perhaps, be pardoned the digression if I draw on my own experience, after thirteen years' residence in China, broken only by a trip through Europe and a very short stay at Washington. The returning American is struck with the general well-being of the people. He does not see, the world over, such crowds of well-dressed people and—I cannot forbear saying—such hale and hearty men and such beautiful women. I desire particularly to allude to the suburban system of electric railways which has grown up in recent years. Remember that *there is not a single street-railroad in China*, and then look on such perfect systems as exist in all our cities! This is but one instance of a magnificent improvement which is not so marked anywhere else as here.

When I went to the Far East I received letters full of congratulations on the life of luxury that was opening before me. As a matter of fact,

almost the humblest house in an American city is better provided with luxuries than is the American Legation at Peking. We drew water from wells, or cisterns, which I constructed. We used coal oil as an illuminant. Our fires were open coal fires. We had an attempt at electric bells; but they never worked. We had no upstairs apartments to our house. There were no sidewalks in Peking, no waterworks, no decent streets. The resident of Washington is a king compared to the native, or foreigner, in Peking.

I shall not, so near the close of this article, enter into a disquisition on our institutions. Suffice it to say that in this country the Government, in all its branches, national, State, and municipal, is the servant of the people: elsewhere it is the master.

And now on the subject of this paper—the Doctrine of Intervention. I reassert that it is our duty to intervene in all matters occurring abroad in which it is to our interest to intervene. I mean our material interest—the interest of our railroads, our merchants, our manufacturers, our ships, our trade, and our commerce.

Far be it from us to endeavor to force republican institutions on the peoples of the world. Far be it from us to wage sentimental or religious wars. Far be it from us to interfere with the operations of any government in its proper territory, be it despotic or be it free. It is none of our business how Russia, or England, or Germany rules its people. Even the ostentatious boasting of some Americans abroad should be discouraged.

It is assumed in polite society that every citizen or subject of any country thinks his own institutions the best, and his own lot the happiest. It is fortunate that this is so. What I do insist on is, that the flag, the world over, shall protect all Americans in their persons, their property, and their commerce; and that on all occasions we should demand such protection.

Further, we should see to it that international law and the laws of foreign countries are administered with absolute impartiality, so far as our interests demand such administration.

CHARLES DENBY.

ANNEXATION AND UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

THE question has been asked, How will the acquisition of new territories, inhabited largely by semi-civilized races, harmonize with the principle of universal suffrage? The answer has to do with the future, and, that it may not be in the nature of an idle prophecy, must be made in the light of our experience. We must review the history of suffrage in our country from the time when it was limited to the few down to the present when it is enjoyed by the many; we must note each step of this steady progress, and carefully observe whether the march has at any time been hastened or at any time been checked by the acquisitions we have made of territory inhabited by people ignorant of our institutions and utterly unfit to vote.

When our forefathers founded the Republic they announced to the world certain political doctrines often asserted, but never before applied. They declared that all men were created equal, and were endowed by the Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that governments were constituted among men for the good of the governed; that they derived their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that when they failed to accomplish the purposes for which they were established it was the duty of the people to amend or destroy them. It might reasonably be supposed that, having deliberately proclaimed these truths, the men of '76 would have instantly made use of them; that, being free to create such governments as they saw fit, they would have founded new commonwealths in which the equality of all men was fully recognized. Had they attempted to apply the new truths generally the whole social fabric would have gone to pieces. Happily they were not so applied. They were ideals to be lived up to and gradually attained; and the very men whose lips were constantly heard demanding the rights of man, the inalienable rights of man, went carefully to work and set up State governments in which the rights of man were very little regarded, in which manhood suffrage was ignored, the ballot given to men who owned property, and office-holding restricted to such as owned lands and houses and were members of some Christian sect. To vote in Massachusetts, a man must have an estate worth sixty

pounds, or a freehold yielding three pounds annual income; to vote in Connecticut, he must own real estate rated on the tax-list at one hundred and thirty-four dollars, or possess an annual income of seven dollars derived from a freehold estate. New York would permit no man to cast a ballot who was not seized of a freehold worth twenty pounds, or did not pay a rent of forty shillings a year and have his name on the list of taxpayers. In Maryland and North Carolina he must own fifty acres of land, and in South Carolina, besides his land, must be a free white believing in the existence of a God and in a future state of reward and punishment. Pennsylvania required the payment of a property tax. In but one State, New Jersey, did the suffrage approach to being universal; and there it was so unintentionally. Her constitution had been hastily made in 1776 in the space of ten days, had never been carefully revised, and gave the franchise to "all inhabitants of the State" who were twenty-one years old and owned fifty pounds of unincumbered property. Nothing was said concerning race, sex, or citizenship; and during thirty-one years women, negroes, and aliens were free to vote and used the right.

Yet, in spite of all this, it would be the height of injustice to accuse the men who imposed these restrictions of inconsistency with their principles. To have suddenly produced such a social condition as they had in mind, to have recklessly removed from the statute-book every law, to have ruthlessly broken down every custom at variance with the new political doctrines, would have been acts of disorganization of the worst kind. But they were in no sense disorganizers. With a steadfast reliance on the soundness of their principles, they waited but for a chance to apply them decently and in order; and when that chance came, when they were called on to make a plan of government for a frontier community where equality was absolute, where customs and usages had little weight and traditions went for nothing, they stood the test, and gave to a vast stretch of territory north of the Ohio an ordinance of government which greatly extended the rights of man.

But that famous Ordinance of 1784 is interesting in another respect. It was our first effort at colonial government, our first attempt to rule a community not fit to become a State and enter the Union; and by it a new political institution, the Territory, was created of two grades.

At the head of the committee which reported the Ordinance was the apostle of liberty, the father of American democracy, the man who wrote the Declaration of Independence. If one member more than another of that committee was bound to carry out the principles of the Declaration, and seek to establish a government in strict accordance with them, that

member was Jefferson. If any one man more than another could be pardoned for attempting to carry the self-evident truth to an extreme, Jefferson was that man. Yet not for a moment was he led astray by the ideals he had announced to the world as the true basis of democratic government. He and his fellow-members knew well that no popular government can stand long or accomplish much for the good of the governed which is not carefully adjusted to the wants, conditions, and intelligence of the people who are to live under it. The plan presented and adopted therefore did not contain one vestige of self-government till there were five thousand free white males living in the territory, and this in spite of the fact that the great majority of them would be citizens from the seaboard States and well accustomed to self-government.

During this period when the Territory was in the first grade the rulers were a governor, a secretary, and three judges, elected by the Continental Congress, but afterward appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The laws were not framed by any legislative body, but were such as the governor and judges selected from the statute-books of the thirteen original States. Till there were five thousand free white males of full age not a vote was cast for a territorial officer. Then any free white man who had lived in the Territory the proper time, and owned fifty acres, might take part in the election of a House of Representatives, every member of which must be possessed of a freehold of two hundred acres. Once assembled the House nominated ten men (each having a freehold of five hundred acres), of whom the President commissioned five to be legislative councillors. Together the Council and the House, by joint ballot, chose a delegate to represent the Territory in the House of Representatives, where he was graciously permitted to speak, but not to vote. The territorial government thus set up by the Continental Congress, and sanctioned by the first Congress under the Constitution, became the model after which every other since established has been closely fashioned. At the foundation of it lay the broad principle that there was one kind of government for the States and another for the Territories; that the just powers of the latter need not be derived from the consent of the governed; that only such men as owned land were fit to vote, and that only the select class who owned a great deal of land were fit to legislate; that the Constitution limited the power of the Federal Government over the States; but that the will of Congress was supreme over the Territories.

The clear distinction between a State and a Territory thus drawn at the very outset of our career, and the principles then established—that

Congress was free to govern the dependencies of the United States in such manner as it saw fit; that the government it granted need not be republican even in form; that men might be taxed without any representation in the taxing body, stripped absolutely of the franchise, and ruled by officials not of their own choice—have never been departed from, and have often been signally confirmed.

The first great confirmation took place when we purchased Louisiana from France in 1803. The treaty provided in one article that for twelve years to come the ships of France and Spain might enter the ports of Louisiana without paying a cent more duty than was exacted from vessels belonging to citizens of the United States. This was a clear discrimination in favor of New Orleans. Should a French or Spanish vessel from Marseilles, Bilboa, or Cadiz enter the port of Boston or New York, she would be subjected to a duty of fifty cents a ton. But the same craft, should she go to New Orleans, would be required to pay no more tonnage than Americans paid, which was but six cents a ton. During the debate on the treaty the Federalists, who bitterly opposed expansion, had much to say questioning the constitutionality of this concession. It will, in the first place, they said, enable the people of New Orleans to trade with France and Spain on far better terms than the merchants of Charleston or New York or any other seaport out of Louisiana. New Orleans therefore is a favored port. But this cannot be allowed; for the Constitution declares that "no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another." Again, the Constitution says Congress shall have power to regulate trade with foreign countries; but this provision in favor of Louisiana is a regulation of trade with France and Spain not by Congress, but by the treaty-making power—the President and Senate—and is unconstitutional and void. To this the Republicans replied, it is true that preference cannot be given to the "ports of one State over those of another": but the prohibition applies to the States, not to the Territories; and as Louisiana is a Territory, not a State, any preference given to New Orleans is valid. It is in the condition of a colony whose commerce may be regulated without reference to any provisions in the Constitution regarding States; for the Constitution does not apply to the Territories.

The position, that the Territories are not under the Constitution, was asserted more boldly still when the time came to frame a government for Louisiana. The Senate sent down to the House a Bill providing that, till such time as Congress should establish a territorial government for Louisiana, all military, civil, and judicial powers should be vested in

such persons and exercised in such way as the President might think fit and proper. This, said the Federalists in the House, is unconstitutional; it is combining in the hands of the President legislative, executive, and judicial powers; for he is not only to appoint public officers, but is also to determine in what manner they shall act. We deny that such is the case, the Republicans answered; but, suppose it to be as stated, the combination is perfectly legal. Whatever limitation the Constitution may set to the power of Congress over the States, it puts none to the power of Congress over the Territories. The Constitution is made for the States, not for the Territories, and does not extend to them. What else is the meaning of the words, "The Congress shall have power to . . . make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States"? Is not the grant unlimited? Has it not always been so construed? Who makes laws in the Territories of Indiana and Mississippi? The people? No. Congress? No: the Governor and the judges appointed by the President. Does not this show that the Constitution is inoperative in the Territories? We are to govern Louisiana not by right of any grant of power expressed in the Constitution, but by right of acquisition; and that right we are to use as we see fit.

Guided by these principles, Congress a little later proceeded to govern Louisiana as it saw fit, cut the province in two, and named a piece, corresponding very nearly to the present State of Louisiana, the "Territory of Orleans." All north of Orleans was annexed to Indiana; but for the Territory itself a separate government was framed, comprising the usual governor, secretary, judges, and a legislative council of thirteen. To the plan as a whole little objection was made when the Bill came before the House of Representatives. But the restriction of trial by jury to criminal prosecutions and to civil suits involving at least one hundred dollars, and the manner of appointing the Council aroused a fierce and stubborn resistance. The thirteen men forming the Council were to be selected and appointed by the President, and by the President alone. The people of Orleans had no voice in their selection; nor was the Senate of the United States to be asked to approve of their appointment. They were to assemble not at any set time, but when summoned by the Governor; were to go home when ordered; and when in session enjoyed the scantiest of legislative powers. No new law could be enacted and no old one amended or repealed without the Council's consent; but it was the Governor who originated all new legislation, and proposed alterations in the laws already in force.

This Bill, said its opponents, violates the Constitution and the great principles of liberty on which our republic rests. Does not one amendment to the Constitution guarantee that in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall have trial by jury? How then can we say that in the Territory of Orleans there shall be no trial by jury in criminal prosecutions, unless one of the parties demand it, or the offence be capital? Yet another amendment to the Constitution ordains that in common-law suits, when the sum in controversy exceeds twenty dollars, the trial shall be before a jury. How then can we say that in Orleans there shall be no such trial unless the sum involved is at least one hundred dollars? Is it not a principle of democracy that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; that taxation and representation are inseparable? But what have the people of Orleans to say in the choice of the legislative Council, in the making of the laws? If we govern, must we not govern on constitutional principles? Have we a right to do there what the Constitution forbids us to do elsewhere?

The answer was, Yes, if it seems expedient; for the Constitution does not apply to the Territories. The Bill does indeed contain principles of government heretofore unknown in the United States. But it is also true that never before was Congress called on to provide a government for such a peculiar people. There, gathered together in one city and along the banks of one river, dwell Frenchmen and Spaniards, Creoles, Americans, Germans, Mexicans, wanderers from Acadia, emigrants from the Canaries, Negroes, and creatures of every conceivable strain of Negro blood from quadroons and octoroons to mulattoes. Ruled first by French, and for the last forty years by Spanish, officials, ground down by monopolies, accustomed to military government, with all the humiliation, extortion, tyranny, and official insolence such government breeds, and stripped of every semblance of the rights of man, they cannot be regarded as fit for sudden liberty. Let them have freedom and republican government by degrees, as they show themselves capable of understanding and able to assume the responsibilities it entails. Let them learn, under the mild and gentle rule of the government we propose, what are the rights and duties of freemen; and when they have learned these it will be time enough to give them self-government and the ballot. Against the mild and gentle rule thus established the people of New Orleans protested vigorously, because they were taxed without representation, obliged to obey laws they had no voice in making and to submit to a government which did not derive its just powers from the consent of the governed. The remonstrance was written by an American; and the

whole movement was the work of Americans,—not of the population which had so long submitted to the grinding rule of France and Spain. Yet Congress yielded, remodelled the form of territorial government, and gave Orleans an assembly, but limited the right of suffrage to the election of members of the assembly, gave no man a vote who was not the possessor of fifty acres of land, and restricted membership in the assembly to men who owned two hundred acres in fee simple.

Against these restrictions the people of the Territories had long been crying out. Scarcely a session of Congress went by without the receipt of petitions, resolutions, or memorials, praying for the extension of the suffrage. But, despite the appeals of the people, the activity of the delegates, and the favorable reports of committees, Congress made no step forward till 1808, when the office of territorial delegate was made elective in Mississippi Territory, and the suffrage given to every free white male of full age who owned fifty acres of land or a town lot worth one hundred dollars. The first step taken, others followed; and in Indiana before 1812 the territorial delegate and council had become elective by the people, and the right to vote had been given to every free male of age who had resided one year in the Territory and had paid a tax. And before 1815 the same privileges were granted to Illinois, Mississippi, and Missouri, a name then given to that vast region which lies north of the State of Louisiana, and stretches away westward from the Mississippi River to the Rocky Mountains.

Now came the great exodus of people from the seaboard; and by 1822 Indiana, Illinois, Alabama, Mississippi, and Missouri had been made States and admitted to the Union, and the organized Territories were reduced to Michigan and Arkansas. To these in 1822 was added Florida. By the acquisition of Florida from Spain our territory was a second time expanded by the addition of foreign soil, and our population a second time increased by thousands of people judged unfit to be free. Congress, moved by the same considerations, asserting the same absolute jurisdiction, and the same exemption from any obligation to follow in territorial government the great principles of the rights of man, gave to the people of Florida in 1822 almost identically the same government given to Orleans in 1804. The Governor, Secretary, and thirteen members of the Council were appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate; but the territorial delegate was made elective by the people, and for the first time the qualifications of voters were left for the Council to decide. This was another step forward, another extension of the suffrage, and was followed, before 1849, by the breaking down

of yet other restrictions, and by granting voters in Michigan, Arkansas, Florida, Wisconsin, Oregon, and Iowa the right to elect all county and township officers save such as were judicial.

Meantime, in 1848, by the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo we acquired for the third time a vast region inhabited by men of mixed races, and low intelligence, living under laws, customs, and usages unlike our own, and were again called on to frame a government for a people knowing little of the principles of American liberty. The result was long delayed by the attempt to open the new Territory to slavery; and in the course of this attempt it was proposed to bring the country under the Constitution, because, as slavery was tolerated under the Constitution, it would thus have to be tolerated in the region obtained as free soil from Mexico, and covered by the Constitution. An amendment was accordingly offered to the civil and diplomatic appropriation Bill providing money to extend the Constitution and certain laws of the United States over the proposed Territories of Utah and New Mexico; and another debate as to the status of a Territory followed.

Extend the Constitution to the Territories? exclaimed Webster. Why the thing is utterly impossible. All the legislation in the world could not accomplish it. We extend the Constitution by law to a Territory? What is the Constitution of the United States? Is not its very first principle that all within its influence and comprehension shall be represented in the legislature it establishes, with not only a right to debate and a right to vote in both Houses of Congress, but a right to partake in the choice of President and Vice-President? Can we by law extend these rights to a Territory? The Constitution is extended over the United States and over nothing else, and can extend over nothing else. It cannot be extended over anything save the old States and the new States that shall come in hereafter, when they do come in. It seems to be taken for granted that trial by jury, the *habeas corpus*, and every principle designed to protect personal liberty is extended by force of the Constitution over every new Territory. So far is this from being the case that not one of these principles can apply to a Territory, till introduced by act of Congress, because a Territory, while a Territory, is not part of the United States.

Calhoun scouted such an idea. The Constitution, said he, in its own words, is the supreme law of the land; and the Territories of the United States are part of the land. It is supreme law not within the limits of the United States merely, but wherever our flag waves, wherever our authority goes. If this is not so, how can we have any juris-

diction? Is not Congress the creature of the Constitution? And shall we, the creatures of the Constitution, pretend that we have any authority beyond its reach?

The Constitution, Webster replied, does not declare itself the supreme law of the land. The Constitution and the laws of Congress passed under it are the supreme laws of the land, that is, the land over which the Constitution is established, or, in other words, the United States. No organization of the Territories was effected till the Compromise of 1850, when the form of government then in use was established, with the provisions as to slavery made necessary by the Compromise. The franchise was extended to all male citizens of the United States resident in Utah or New Mexico; but the qualifications of voters, after the first election, were to be determined by the territorial legislatures, provided the suffrage was not extended to any save citizens of the United States. In June, 1862, the question which had so long disturbed the country was put at rest by the abolition of slavery in the Territories; and in 1867 it was ordained that henceforth and forever there should be no denial of suffrage in any Territory, then existing or yet to be made, to any citizen thereof because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

This ended the work of Congress in behalf of the extension of suffrage. Starting with the rude provisions laid down by the Continental Congress in the Ordinances of 1784 and 1787, it had in the course of eighty-three years reached universal manhood suffrage for a wide range of offices. At first no voters existed. Then men owning fifty acres of land might vote for one branch of the legislature. Before the first quarter of our century was turned the territorial delegate and the members of the second branch of the legislature were elected by the people, the property qualification for voters was swept away and the payment of a tax substituted, and the qualification of electors of the territorial delegates was left for the legislatures to decide. When the middle of the century came any free white male citizen of the United States could vote, and every town and county officer not judicial had been made elective. Twenty-five years later the Negro had been enfranchised, and the legislatures were regulating the qualifications of voters.

A review of the history of suffrage in the Territories thus makes it clear that foreign soil acquired by Congress is the property of and not part of the United States; that the Territories formed from it are without, and not under, the Constitution; and that in providing them with governments Congress is at liberty to establish just such kind as it pleases,

with little or no regard for the principles of self-government; that in the past it has set up whatever sort was, in its opinion, best suited to meet the needs of the people, never stopping to ask how far the government so created derived its just powers from the consent of the governed; and that it is under no obligation to grant even a restricted suffrage to the inhabitants of any new soil we may acquire, unless they are fit to use it properly. Congress is indeed morally bound to give the very best government that circumstances will permit; but it is also morally bound not to be carried away by theories of human rights which even the States themselves ignore. We have no such thing as unrestricted universal suffrage. In the States east of the Mississippi no woman may cast a ballot for a governor, for a congressman, or for Presidential electors. Yet in each one of them are numbers of women who own property, and pay taxes amounting sometimes to thousands of dollars a year. What government derives its just powers from their consent? Are they not taxed without representation? Do they not obey laws in the making of which they have no voice? All this is utterly inconsistent with the broad doctrines on which our republican form of government is founded. The truth is, the suffrage never has been and is not to-day regulated on any other principle than expediency. Nor is this to be regretted. No government is worth a rush unless it is practical; and to be practical it must not be in advance of the intelligence and capacity for self-government possessed by the people for whose welfare it has been created. This has been the characteristic of every government yet set up in State or Territory, and is greatly to our credit; and this is the course we must pursue in the treatment of any people, whatever their stage of civilization, who may come to us with new acquisitions of territory.

J. B. McMASTER.

LESSONS OF THE RECENT ELECTION.

BEFORE the breaking out of hostilities in the Spanish War, the conditions which always defeat the party in power in an off-year prevailed to an unusual degree. Several hundred thousand disappointments over the distribution of patronage; hostility of the masses to Civil Service reform, which President McKinley had permitted to stand in its literal fullness; the general desire of the people to rest from campaign excitement after the heated contest of 1896; the prevalent, but shallow, argument that there could be no pressing necessity for a Sound Money Congress so long as Mr. McKinley occupied the White House to veto any destructive legislation that might be attempted; the complete absorption of commercial and industrial managers in the enlarged transactions of returning prosperity, and the satisfaction of the laboring-classes with the renewal of work and wages which the last election had brought to them, combined to render the prospect of Republican defeat certain, if not overwhelming.

In the midst of this period of gloom came the declaration of war, with swift preparations for collision with a foreign foe, which so aroused the national pride and spirit as to submerge for the moment all factional differences and personal disappointments in a patriotic determination to support the President to the utmost. If actual hostilities had continued eight or ten weeks longer, with the accompanying unification and elevation of public sentiment, a Republican campaign would have been superfluous, and a Democratic campaign impossible. The people *en masse* would have taken charge of politics; and the Administration would have won nearly everywhere. The war, however, ended as suddenly as it began; and it was followed by a storm of criticism as intemperate as it was demoralizing.

But shortly the truth concerning alleged mismanagement in the armies began to creep out. It was so different from the allegations of the newspapers as to cause a suspension of public judgment, with evidences of an approaching reaction in public sentiment. Besides, the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, followed by unsettled problems involved in the Spanish peace protocol, brought forward questions of territorial expansion and colonial policy which divided the masses along new

lines. Thus, at a late hour of the campaign popular sentiment was nebulous, formative, and—chaotic.

Here was the moment at which the Republican managers must decide on a policy to govern their campaign that would interest and align the voters. The managers knew, which the masses did not, that the strenuous efforts of the Opposition leaders to secure control of Congress by denouncing the conduct of the war did not spring from a desire to investigate army management, in which Democrats, as privates and commanders, were joint participants with the Republicans, but from a purpose to get into position to enact Free-Silver legislation and to elect a Free-Silver President.

That knowledge determined the line of attack; and the committee machinery was promptly set in motion to send Sound Money literature and speakers among the voters. As little else had been used in Oregon for the June elections, which resulted in unexpectedly large Republican majorities over those of 1896, I was confirmed in my belief that the real foundation of Republican success lay in the confidence of the world in the Republican financial policy. I had a deep feeling that the substantial people of the United States, and everybody doing business with the United States, were perfect in the faith that Republican supremacy meant the payment of all obligations in sound money—in gold or its equivalent. Added to this basic advantage were: the great personal popularity of President McKinley; a universal desire to sustain his war policy; the revival of business predicted by the Republicans in 1896; and a thorough Republican organization brought over from the previous national campaign.

On the other hand, we were confronted by some special disadvantages. Many thousands of men who were at home idle in 1896, with plenty of time not only for voting, but for campaigning, for the Republican ticket, had work and wages in 1898, and therefore could give little attention to politics. Not only so, but thousands of them were away from their voting precincts as railway brakemen, firemen, conductors, and engineers; other thousands, as employees on vessels, woodsmen, agents, lumbermen, and general mechanics; so that perhaps a half-million men who were at the polls in 1896, voting the Republican ticket, were in 1898 kept away either by their own disinclination to lose wages or by the absolute necessities of enlarging business transactions.

Certain local conditions also contributed to Republican campaign burdens. Canal troubles in New York, bank matters in North Dakota, a factional fight for the governorship in Wisconsin, peculiar party dif-

ferences in Michigan, labor disturbances in Illinois, a violent factional uprising in Pennsylvania, and race conflicts in sections of the South added to Republican depression.

These adverse features, however, were offset by the firm adhesion to the Republican party of the middle business classes, who renounced Democracy in 1896 on the Free Silver issue. This was particularly true in the West, where Sound Money Democrats, especially the Germans, were so disgusted by the appointment as general manager of the Democratic party of "Coin" Harvey, the arch-apostle of "Free Silver at the God-given ratio of 16 to 1," that they actively and effectively espoused the cause of the Republican candidates.

Most of them now declare that they intend to remain permanently with the Republican party; and their affiliation constitutes the very best element added to that organization since the Rebellion, when it was expanded into a nation-saver by an army of stalwart patriots known as "War Democrats."

There is but one standpoint from which I can obtain a satisfactory view of political management and the results of political contests—that of the business man. To my mind, the most important victory is the one which insures to our country the longest term of industrial peace and financial security. So long as any avenue shall remain open to those who are determined to tinker with our money standard, or to discharge obligations by fiat, or to inject debased currency into the sensitive arteries of finance, there can be no such security or peace.

The recent elections closed those avenues, and closed them securely. Fiat Money, Free Silver, and radical tariff agitation will be innocuous for at least eight years; for that is the shortest assured period of "honest money" control of the United States Senate. Thus, the agriculturist may contract for a farm; the manufacturer, for an enlargement of his plant; the lumberman, for standing pine; the banker, for an increase of his capital; the transportation manager, for an extension of his railway or multiplication of his fleet of ships; and the wage-earner for his cottage home, and be sure of eight years of approved fiscal conditions in which to carry out their plans and liquidate their debts.

In all my experience, my countrymen have had no richer prospect. For having been placed where I could contribute any part toward insuring the blessings of this fruitful condition, I am profoundly grateful; and I hope to see my fellow-citizens so take advantage of it as to become more universally prosperous and contented than they have been during any like period of their history.

J. W. BABCOCK.

FOREST FIRES.

THE principal enemies of the forest are the axe and fire. The axe destroys its thousands; but, while witnessing this destruction, we are consoled by the thought that the stately trees thus brought low are felled for the use of man. From man's point of view, one of the purposes for which they grew, if not the chief purpose, was to minister to his needs—to provide material for his houses, to support his railway-tracks and telegraph-wires, and to warm him in wintry weather. Therefore, few people grudge to the axe its inroads upon the forest. We are consoled further by the thought, that in all probability the axe is destroying the forest no faster than it grows. Were the axe the only enemy of the forest, we might look with complacency upon its inroads, wasteful though they be; having the assurance that Nature was replacing tree for tree.

But where the axe has slain its thousands, fire has destroyed its tens of thousands; and here the destruction does not in any way conduce to man's welfare, but is a misfortune without one redeeming feature. Every year, when the summer heats have dried the vegetation, forest fires prevail over the Northwest, from the Great Lakes to Puget Sound, and over the pineries of the South; and thousands of square miles of forests go up in smoke. In addition to millions of dollars' worth of timber there are destroyed each year ranches, and even towns, which stand in the track of the flames, not to speak of the loss of life.

Let us get some measure of the amount of this destruction. In the year 1880, in connection with the Tenth Census of the United States, Prof. C. S. Sargent collected all possible information concerning the forest fires which occurred during that year. The results of that investigation, which, in the nature of things, could not be exhaustive, showed that there were burned at least ten and a quarter million acres of forest land—an area twice the size of New Jersey. The value of the property thus destroyed was more than \$25,000,000. This is the tale of one year, and a year not at all remarkable for its forest fires.

The thick forests upon the Pacific Coast, especially those of Western Washington and Oregon—the densest in the country, with the sole exception of the redwoods of California—are every summer the scene of

great and destructive fires. In this region there are only two seasons, a wet and a dry. From May to October it seldom rains. By the first day of August everything is as dry as tinder; and then the fires begin. For two months, until put out by the fall rains, they prevail; covering the land with a pall of smoke as dense as the fog of the New England Coast. The magnificent scenery of the Cascade range, with its great extinct volcanoes and its glaciers, is completely hidden from view. Because of the smoke, the navigation of Puget Sound and the Columbia River is as dangerous as in times of fog. The roads and trails are blocked, and travel on them perforce suspended, not only by the fires immediately, but by their tree-victims, which, weakened by the flames, fall for months and years after the fire has swept through the country. The smoke is often so dense and acrid as seriously to affect the eyesight; and yet, with their proverbial patience, the American people suffer all these ills without a thought of remedying them.

Within a generation a fifth of the magnificent forests of Western Washington have gone up in smoke,—a splendid tribute to the carelessness and wastefulness of the people of the Northwest. Timber having a stumpage value of \$30,000,000 has thus been thrown away in a part of this one State.

In the Rocky Mountain region the aridity of the climate is in general so great as to prevent tree growth except upon the slopes of the mountains. It is in this arid region, where timber is scarce and where it is greatly needed for mine timbering, fuel, and railroad construction, that fires are and have been most frequent. Indeed they have been so prevalent that there are few old forests in the region; nearly all of the existing ones being less than a century old. Over great areas the forests have been permanently destroyed; converting the denuded spaces into parks or elevated pasture lands. The summit of the Bighorn Mountains, in Wyoming, consists in large part of open park-land; the forests having been destroyed by the persistent burning of the country by the Indians for the purpose of driving game, or of increasing the area of pasturage for their ponies. Owing to the same cause, the Black Hills of South Dakota consist largely of open parks.

The fires in the Rocky Mountain region, besides the destruction of timber and the reduction in the forest area, have produced this result, viz., that in many parts of that country the timber which grows after the fires is of different species, and generally of less economic value than that which was destroyed. Thus, the Western white pine, yellow pine, red fir, and cedar are often succeeded by lodge-pole pine, Pinon pine, and

quaking aspen—species of little economic importance. Indeed, in general the character of this succession suggests that the climate of this region is becoming more arid, inasmuch as the evident tendency is to replace the burnt forests by more arid types of trees.

During the summer of 1898 forest fires were more numerous and destructive than they had been for many years, especially in the Rocky Mountain country and upon the Pacific Coast. They have raged over Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California. The newspapers from this part of the country have for months been filled with accounts of the destruction wrought; and there is abundant evidence, in the attention given to the subject, that such a terrible visitation was needed to awaken the people of that section to the necessity of protecting their timber supplies. In those States there is no provision for such protection beyond the United States laws, enforced by a newly organized body of rangers, under the control of the General Land Office; and this has been of little avail in either the prevention or the extinction of fires. Even in such States as Wisconsin and Minnesota, where fire laws exist, which under ordinary circumstances are efficiently carried out, fires during the past summer have been frequent and disastrous.

The cause of the increase in fires during the past season lies in the dryness of the summer. The rainfall was unusually slight all over the Northwest; so that the vegetation became very dry and ready to ignite on very slight provocation. In another way the dryness of the season contributed to an increase in the tendency to fires. Throughout the West the pasturage at low altitudes was destroyed by the drought, in consequence of which the sheep-herders, in order to prevent the starvation of their flocks, were compelled to take them to meadows among the forests high up the mountains. The presence of the herders has doubtless increased the number of conflagrations; for, as is well known, they are not over-careful with their camp-fires.

The evil effects of forest fires are not confined to the destruction of timber. A fierce fire injures the soil in such a way as to make it incapable of supporting forest growth for many years. Long after a fire the surface of the burn is covered with brush and briars; and the restoration of the forest goes on very slowly. Meantime, if the burned area is upon a mountain-side, the soil washes away; leaving perhaps only naked rock, upon which trees cannot obtain a foothold.

An indirect result of the fires, and one of great importance, is to be seen in the ordinary methods pursued in lumbering. As a rule, the lum-

berman clears the land as he goes of all the timber of any value. It would be more profitable to him, in the long run, as he well knows, if he felled the mature and larger trees only; leaving the saplings to reach maturity before being cut, and thus insuring a continuous income from his land. Under existing conditions, however, he cannot afford to run the risk of leaving a part of his property thus standing, owing to the danger of its destruction by fire; hence, for very good financial reasons, he makes a clean sweep of the timber.

Forest fires are not new; there is indeed good evidence to the effect that long before the white man occupied this country his predecessor burned the forest with quite as much activity and success. The prairie region bears witness to this; for, now that fires are abated, much of it—except where cultivated—is rapidly producing timber. The Valley of Virginia, which, when the white man entered it, was a prairie, is also becoming a forested region. In the Rocky Mountains we find forests of all ages; indicating the occurrence of fires at corresponding periods. And the high mountain parks are also evidence of ancient firing.

In the early stages of white settlement the forest was regarded as a positive nuisance; hence, in clearing land for cultivation, fire was freely used, and little heed was taken if it extended beyond the selected area. Consequently an enormous waste of timber always attended the earlier settlement of the forest regions. As settlement progressed, and timber became of value, there was less recklessness shown in its waste; and when it began to be scarce the people first awoke to the necessity of husbanding their resources. Steps were finally taken to prevent fires; but most of the timber had already been destroyed. Now that the pine of New England is practically exhausted, efficient means of prevention are taken. The stable door is locked; but the horse has already been stolen. We see, from east to west, all stages in this progressive appreciation of the value of timber—from the most criminal disregard and waste of it in the Far West to the careful husbanding of it in New England.

The causes of forest fires are numerous. No one cause can be pointed out as the principal source of the mischief. Nearly all are the result of accident or carelessness, and but few of malice. It is probable that fires set for the purpose of clearing land, and which get beyond control, are responsible for quite as much damage as those due to any other cause. In lumbering operations, after the lumber has been cleared from the land, the tops become dry and inflammable, and are easily ignited either by accident or by design. Such very frequently get beyond control, and run into the forest. Camp-fires, carelessly left burning, are doubtless

responsible for no small percentage. Fires are not infrequently set by hunters, especially Indians, to drive game from its covert. Sometimes the fires are set by prospectors to uncover ledges, and by sheep-herders to extend and improve the pasturage. Locomotives are doubtless responsible for many fires; and it is said that lightning contributes its quota.

Forest fires differ greatly in intensity and in the amount of resultant damage. The great majority merely run along the ground; licking up the grass, underbrush, and forest litter, and doing no damage to trees other than scorching the outer bark. Some develop sufficient heat to destroy the young saplings and to burn through the bark of the mature trees. In the latter case, fire scars are produced which may develop disease and eventually destroy the trees. Others, still fiercer and more destructive, make a more or less clean sweep of the forest. Fires of the last-mentioned kind are not common; but, on the other hand, they are naturally the most extensive. Among them may be instanced the "big burn" in Western Oregon, near the Pacific Coast, which extended from Tillamook southward to the neighborhood of Coos Bay,—a distance of 150 miles, with an average breadth of 20 to 25 miles,—and the burns in Whatcom, Skamania, and Cowlitz counties, Washington, which swept the timber for hundreds of square miles.

Different species of trees suffer from fire in different degrees. Resinous trees, especially those with thin bark, such as the pines, and particularly the yellow pine, are very combustible, and fall an easy prey to the flames. The red fir, the most valuable tree of the Northwest, is much less combustible, as it possesses a thick bark and contains comparatively little resin; while the California redwood is so wet that no fire can sustain itself among them. There have never been fires among the redwoods. In burnt areas it is common for fires to make selections among the trees; limiting the destruction to certain species.

Although forest fires were long recognized as an evil of the first magnitude, no concerted attempt was made until recent years to abate them. It was everybody's business; therefore it concerned no one in particular. The Federal Government, being the largest owner of timber-land, was naturally expected to take the lead in the matter. Until very recently, however, it did nothing; and it was long before any of the States took action. New York was the first to take up the matter in earnest. In 1885 a law was passed by the Legislature, providing fines and imprisonment for setting fires, whether by intention or carelessness; and an organization of fire wardens was made. This organization has proved efficient; and we now hear little of forest fires in New York State. Fol-

lowing New York's lead, New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania have all, within the past few years, taken similar action; and until the present year these States have been almost entirely free from fires. Their experience demonstrates that the evil can be greatly diminished, if not eradicated.

Within the past few years the United States has withdrawn from sale and settlement a large part of the forest land yet remaining in its possession—lying mainly in the high mountains of the West—and is now organizing a force of rangers for the protection and administration of these forest reserves. Its ill-success in preventing and extinguishing fires during the past summer must not be accepted as evidence of incompetency on the part of its body of rangers; for they worked under most adverse conditions. The dryness of the season produced an unusual number of fires; and for the same reason these fires were most unmanageable. The men are, necessarily, lacking in experience; for men of experience in this work are not to be had. Most of the forest reserves were not manned until the season was far advanced and the fires were under full headway. Moreover, it must be said that throughout most of the Western country the people are not in sympathy with the forest-reserve policy; and their aid has been wanting in preventing and extinguishing fires. All these facts should be considered in making out a case against the management of the forest reserves.

It is probable, however, that the experiences of the people of the West during the past summer have induced a change in their attitude toward the forests and the forest-reserve policy of the Government, and that they now see that in the long run the Government's action will further their best interests. Hereafter the people will doubtless heartily second the efforts of the Government to preserve some portions of the forests for the permanent prosperity of that part of the country.

That fires can be practically prevented, is shown by the experience of the Northeastern States, where in recent years they have been almost unknown. This exemption is in part due to stringent laws, thoroughly enforced, and in part to a strong public sentiment supporting the enforcement of the laws. That they can be prevented even in the Wild West, is shown by the experience in Yellowstone Park, where for nearly a score of years fires have been practically unknown, although for three months of the year the Park is full of camping-parties. It is not practicable, however, for the Government to patrol its forest lands, comprising a hundred thousand square miles, as thoroughly as it does the comparatively small area of Yellowstone Park. It can easily, however, by

watching the roads and trails, keep an account of the parties entering these lands, whether campers, hunters, prospectors, or sheep-herders, and thus be prepared to fix responsibility upon the authors of the mischief. A knowledge that they are being watched will be sufficient to insure care on the part of visitors to Government lands. Furthermore, it might be of advantage in many ways to allow prospecting of these lands only under a Government license, and to issue permits to sheep-herders; assigning definite ranges to the latter, and making them responsible for fires occurring within their limits.

But, after all preventive measures have been adopted, some fires will still occur; and steps should be taken to limit and extinguish them.

Light surface fires can be easily extinguished by various means. Many of them can be simply beaten out with brush. If too serious for such treatment, the forest litter may be raked out of their track; leaving them little to feed upon. They can then be beaten out. Another method, which answers the same purpose, is to plough or trench the ground in front of them. More serious fires require more drastic treatment; and to provide against these, preparations should be made in all densely forested regions in advance. Broad roads should be cleared at frequent intervals, not only for quick and easy communication, but to serve as fire-lanes, up to which fires may spread, but beyond which they may be prevented from passing. These fire-lanes, which may be either roads or streams, commonly serve as the battlefields,—the scenes of conflict with the flames. Here “back fires” should be set on the side from which the fire is approaching. A strip the full width of the fire is burned over, and is checked at the fire-lane: this is usually sufficient to stop the fire. It may, however, overleap the lane in spots, which will then require special treatment with water, sod, earth, brush, etc.

For a struggle with a large forest fire, a considerable force of men is needed; and it is here that the sympathies of the inhabitants are required. A few rangers can do no more than watch for fires, and perhaps put them out if discovered in their early stages; but when a fire is in full sway a small army of men is necessary to conquer it.

A fire in the forests, especially at night, is one of the grandest and most awe-inspiring spectacles in nature. A wall of flame, a hundred feet or more in height, borne by a gale created by its own heat, rushes onward, with spurts of flame darting upward 200 or 300 feet, as each new victim is seized; burning brightly for a few moments, and then subsiding, to shoot up elsewhere. It is a magnificent spectacle, but one too expensive to be indulged in even by Americans. HENRY GANNETT.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

EXAGGERATED importance has been attached by extreme Civil Service reform advocates, as well as by political spoilsmen, to my recent interpretations of President Cleveland's Proclamation of July 14, 1886, relating to the political activity of Federal office-holders. Extremists have freely contended that I have let down the fences and invited despoliation of Civil Service principles by the wild steers from the farm of ward politics, and have accomplished something of unique advantage to my party.

I can see no ground for special excitement from any quarter. My only thought has been to give to men and women under my supervision, as First Assistant Postmaster-General, the exercise of the freedom conferred upon them by the Constitution of the United States.

The comments upon my action by the press, both *pro* and *con*, have brought me a large correspondence from people throughout the country, entertaining various views upon the subject: and I believe much good will result; for I am now convinced that only a small proportion of the voters of the country have a really fair conception of either the letter or the spirit of President Cleveland's famous order. Men who would throttle those in the Federal service, and forbid any expression whatever from them, have given President Cleveland's Proclamation an interpretation differing widely from its writer's intention. Here is the document in full:

“EXECUTIVE MANSION,
WASHINGTON, July 14, 1886.

To the Heads of Departments in the service of the General Government:

I deem this a proper time to especially warn all subordinates in the several Departments and all office-holders under the General Government, against the use of their official positions in attempts to control political movements in their localities.

Office-holders are the agents of the people, not their masters. Not only is their time and labor due to the Government, but they should scrupulously avoid in their political action as well as in the discharge of their official duty, offending by a display of obtrusive partisanship, their neighbors who have relations with them as public officials.

They should also constantly remember that their party friends, from whom they have received preferment, have not invested them with the power of arbitrarily managing their political affairs. They have no right as office-holders to dictate the political action of their party associates, or to throttle freedom of action within

party lines, by methods and practices which pervert every useful and justifiable purpose of party organization.

The influence of Federal officeholders should not be felt in the manipulation of political primary meetings and nominating conventions. The use by these officials of their positions to compass their selection as delegates to political conventions is indecent and unfair; and proper regard for the proprieties and requirements of official place will also prevent their assuming the active conduct of political campaigns.

Individual interest and activity in political affairs are by no means condemned. Office-holders are neither disfranchised nor forbidden the exercise of political privileges; but their privileges are not enlarged nor is their duty to party increased to pernicious activity, by officeholding.

A just discrimination in this regard between the things a citizen may properly do and the purposes for which a public office should not be used, is easy in the light of a correct appreciation of the relation between the people and those intrusted with official place, and a consideration of the necessity under our form of government, of political action free from official coercion.

You are requested to communicate the substance of these views to those for whose guidance they are intended.

GROVER CLEVELAND."

President Cleveland penned the foregoing under peculiar circumstances. It was undoubtedly intended to meet conditions then existing that do not exist to-day. It is well to go back to the conditions which suggested the adoption of the original Civil Service Law, placed upon our statute-book January 16, 1883, in order to have a full conception of them and of President Cleveland's motives.

The Presidential campaigns of 1876 and 1880 are acknowledged by everyone to have been the most corrupt in the annals of our country's politics. There were a great many things in the campaign of 1876 which made honest men blush, and to which the good men of our country in all political parties refer to this day with shame. President Hayes himself vied with the earliest advocates of Civil Service reform in denouncing many of the proceedings of the campaign which resulted in his own election. Ward heelers and slum "bummers" were conspicuous factors in the Presidential campaigns of 1876 and 1880. Money was paid out with free hands by the managers of political parties. There was a great deal said in the campaign of 1876 about the millions of Mr. Tilden and the millions of dollars in the hands of the Republican managers. My own State (Indiana) was a storm-centre. Good citizens everywhere, after these famous campaigns, demanded a halt. When the Forty-seventh Congress convened in 1882, they joined hands in a demand for a law that would make corruption and improper conduct impossible in future campaigns.

In the campaigns referred to, postmasters, collectors of internal revenue and customs, United States marshals, and even men upon the

Federal bench, were leaders in political management. The post-offices of the country were the head centres of each community; and there clustered in them on week-nights and on Sundays the floating voters to accept their money, and managers to take instructions. Postmasters were largely the chairmen of ward, township, city, county, or district committees. They handled the mails with a view to party advantage. Their employees, every one, were of their own political faith. No man held a position for a moment who did not work and vote for the political principles of the party in power.

It was under these circumstances, with these proceedings and these recollections fresh in the minds of the members of the Forty-seventh Congress, that the Civil Service Law was conceived and enacted. Originally its scope was narrow; embracing only 13,924 positions, as against 83,817 classified ones to-day. It was believed that only clerkships in the Executive Departments paying from \$900 to \$1,800 should be under the control of the Civil Service Commission, or subject to its Rules. These positions were regarded as merely clerical, and without any real political influence.

I recall the complaints emanating from spoilsmen when President Arthur put into vigorous force the original Civil Service Act. Great pressure was brought upon him to circumscribe the Rules thereunder. Spoilsmen in office winced and murmured bitterly under the yoke of restriction placed upon them. It was with great difficulty that Federal office-holders of any grade adjusted themselves to the new condition of affairs. The narrow limitations of the Law and Rules at that time did not bring about the reform designed as speedily as was intended. In the campaign of 1884 there was a great deal of political activity, and much political favoritism and oppression was applied to men and women within the classified service. When President Cleveland was elected in that campaign the Civil Service Law and the Rules operating under it were yet restricted, and their enforcement in many respects lax. The campaign was a very bitter one, as everyone will recollect. Mr. Cleveland was elected by the narrow margin of 1,100 votes, the majority in New York State. It was alleged that there was extreme political activity among the Federal office-holders in Mr. Cleveland's own State; and of course he must have had a vivid recollection of the campaign when, two years later, on July 14, 1886, just at the opening of a congressional campaign, he penned the Proclamation given above, warning Federal office-holders against offensive or pernicious political activity.

Conditions existed in 1886 that do not exist now. President Cleve-

land, in the light of that day, may have been justified in restraining Federal office-holders in the exercise of their influence in politics.

The country has taken great strides in the purification of politics during the past decade. The people have been educated to respect the right of franchise. Nearly every State has now the Australian Ballot Law, which insures an honest vote and an honest return. Votes cannot now be openly purchased. Indeed, under the Australian system it is almost impossible to corrupt the ballot. A voter may be hired to stay away from the polls. Campaigns now cost money for education, literature, halls, bands, and speakers; but, by the very conditions existing, there is no longer much latitude for the exercise of official power in campaigns. Otherwise, Presidents would not be repeatedly defeated for reelection, and the political complexion of Congress would not so frequently and regularly change.

President Cleveland, at the time he penned his Proclamation, must have had in mind the unjust exercise by postmasters of official influence in campaigns; for I find the following section of "Postal Laws and Regulations" framed to conform to President Cleveland's Proclamation,—the language of the latter being paraphrased in the Post-Office regulation:

"Office-holders must not use their official positions to control political movements. They should not offend by obtrusive partisanship, nor should they assume the active conduct of political campaigns. A postmaster is not forbidden to exercise any political privilege, but should make proper discrimination between what ought and what ought not to be done by a public officer. He serves all the people, who are entitled to attention, civility, and assistance. He should be patient and helpful. No postmaster in whom the Government has, by virtue of his appointment, reposed trust and confidence, should find difficulty in deciding as to the proper course to be pursued in the premises. This is in consonance with the order of President Cleveland of July 14, 1886." (Sec. 435, p. 192.)

The above is now one of the regulations which govern the Post-Office Department and all employees under it. I notice that in the Report of the Civil Service Commission for 1896-97 (page 125) the statement is made that the "foregoing regulation has *peculiar* application to postmasters."

Undoubtedly President Cleveland intended to put a stop to the practice of making the post-office of a community the head centre of political activity, for the holding of caucuses and committee meetings, the raising of money for the conduct of campaigns, the issuance of instructions to workers, and the control of conventions and primaries. The Proclamation was vigorously enforced; and it had its intended effect. It is enforced to-day; but there is little cause to reiterate it. If there is

any post-office in the country where such political work is proceeding as was common at the time this Proclamation was issued, there is no one who would more cheerfully enforce the regulation and put a stop to the practice than the writer.

It was not intended by any intelligent advocate of Civil Service reform, no matter how extreme his views, that when a man entered the classified service he should lose his identity, that he should cease to be a citizen (in that his office-holding disfranchised him), or that he should neglect to vote or take an interest in the issues controlling political campaigns. When we strip office-holders of these rights some other influence than that secured by interest in politics takes their place.

In the District of Columbia social and religious ties wield the influence once exercised in official life in securing favors for office-holders. I do not mean to say that social or church influences curb the enforcement of the Civil Service Law, nor that no political consideration is given to those within the classified service here in Washington; but I do mean to say that the element of politics, as an influence in the classified service, has so far disappeared that the other influences named are actively and constantly at work to gain favor for those who are classified.

About a year ago I removed for incompetency a man occupying a prominent place in the classified service. He had been given the required charge in writing and had submitted his answer, but he failed to disprove incompetency. On the day on which my removal order became effective the man's pastor called upon me. He was very much provoked over my action, even after I had made it clear to him that the removal was purely on the ground of the man's glaring incompetence to perform his official duties. "Suppose he is incompetent," said the pastor, "he is one of the best men in my church. He has been an usher and a deacon, and he passes the plate!" Inquiry disclosed the fact that this man was appointed at the instance of President Cleveland, upon the request of the pastor of the church which the President attended, and that the incompetency of the man was so well known to the postmaster prior to the appointment that he protested against receiving him into the service. The President sent for the postmaster, and insisted that the man should be given the position. When the postmaster still hesitated, the President is said to have stated, with a smile, but with firmness: "Why, this man puts the plate under my nose every Sunday at church; and if I do not give him this place, after he and his pastor have insisted, I shall be ashamed to look into that plate again!" Though the position was un-

classified at the time of the application, the President must have known that one of his forthcoming Proclamations would extend the classified service to cover this appointment.

The question arises whether the substitute is better than the original, or whether it would not be better for the power of citizenship to be sufficiently active to neutralize other influences.

The Civil Service Law is a law of conscience with the President. It is a power delegated by Congress, with a mere outline of direction; the details being left to the regulations and rules prepared under the direction of the President, who is also empowered to make extensions and restrictions. I believe that every man who has occupied the office of President of the United States since the enactment of the Civil Service Law has faithfully endeavored to enforce that law.

I have had the pleasure of knowing nearly every individual member of the Civil Service Commission since the first was appointed. They have been men of a high order of character, education, and intelligence. They have performed their duties conscientiously, faithfully, and without fear. The present board is one of the ablest official bodies in Washington, and is composed of men who would wink at no hocus-pocus intended to defeat the purposes of the Civil Service Law or any of its Rules.

There is under my general direction more than one-half of the entire classified service of the country. I presume I have more business before the Civil Service Commission than all of the other Executive officers of the Government combined; and I am proud to say that my relations with the present Commissioners are as agreeable personally as they are intimate officially.

I have a vivid recollection of my introduction to the Civil Service Commission, shortly after assuming my present official position, in March, 1897. Mr. Rice, of New York, then occupied the chair now filled by Mr. Brewer, of Michigan. The Civil Service Law and its Rules constitute a complicated volume. There are extensive ramifications in them; and it requires a great deal of study and practice to become proficient in their administration. After a session of about two hours, in which I was taken through a "course of sprouts" by the Commission, a member of that body—I believe President Procter—turned to me and said:

"You can get a very fair conception of your duty in the administration of the laws for which we stand by considering yourself at all times and under all circumstances as the judge of a court, and looking upon the people as the jury. You are

a member of the Administration upon whom the duty is devolved of enforcing the Civil Service Law. Should you do anything at any time, or permit anything to be done, within the Civil Service that will be disapproved by the people, the Administration will pay the penalty. You will do well, as judge of the court over which you preside, to keep your eyes and your ears directed toward the jury—the people.”

I have never lost sight of this homely admonition. It was very early in the days of the present National Administration that the exercise of political freedom by classified office-holders was first agitated. A letter-carrier in Chicago wrote me, inquiring whether, if he should be elected a delegate to a political convention, without any effort or solicitation upon his part, he would be permitted to attend that convention, provided he secured a substitute to perform his official duties, and his work would in no wise suffer. In reply I stated that it was not the exercise of political freedom or political rights to which objection could be made, but the manner in which the rights were exercised. I admonished him to perform faithfully all of the official duties devolving upon him, and not to absent himself from his work during the hours of regular assignment; and I concluded by stating that if he conducted himself in an orderly way as a good citizen, was not offensive, and did not neglect his official duties, I could see no reason why he could not discharge the duties devolving upon him as a delegate to the convention. Shortly afterward I received a letter from the chairman of a Republican county committee in Ohio, making complaint that the postmaster of his town was a member of the Democratic county central committee, and requesting that I require him to resign from the position of postmaster. I wrote to my correspondent, inquiring whether the postmaster was an efficient official, whether he was offensive in his political views, or talked politics in the post-office, or met politicians there for consultation, or neglected his official duties on account of his connection with the Democratic county committee. In his reply my correspondent stated that he would be frank and fair enough to answer all my questions in the negative. He said the postmaster was a good officer and very popular, but that it was provoking to him (the writer) to see the name of the postmaster on the letter-head of the Democratic county organization, and to see the postmaster, after he closed his office at night, visit the headquarters of the county opposition, and consult and work with that party.

I carefully read over President Cleveland's Proclamation, and scrutinized the regulations of the Department bearing upon it; and I could find no provision condemning the attitude of that postmaster. He did

not use his official position to control political movements, did not give his time or labor to party work when he should have been at his official post of duty, did not offend anyone by the display of obtrusive partisanship, did not arbitrarily manage political affairs, did not throttle freedom of action within party lines; nor was it shown that he was manipulating political primary meetings and nominating conventions. In studying this case I could not keep my eyes off these words in President Cleveland's Proclamation: "Individual interest and activity in political affairs are by no means condemned. Office-holders are neither disfranchised nor forbidden the exercise of political privileges; but their privileges are not enlarged, nor is their duty to party increased to pernicious activity, by officeholding."

It will be seen by this quotation that President Cleveland encouraged, rather than denounced, individual interest in political affairs. In the many complaints that have reached me from various sections of the country respecting the political activity and political improprieties of postmasters and other officers, not one charge has been made that a postmaster coerced his employees, or levied political contributions, or neglected his official duties in attending a convention or in delivering speeches or in writing partisan articles for newspapers. Nearly all of the complaints have been that postmasters simply announced their political views, or were present at political meetings, or made political contributions outside their offices. I believe there was less political activity among Federal office-holders in the campaign just closed than in any campaign in the history of the country.

Much misapprehension and exaggeration exists to this day among intelligent and well-informed men as to the real meaning of President Cleveland's "pernicious activity" Proclamation and official interpretations placed upon it. Only the other day I received a letter from one of the oldest and best-informed Congressmen in the West. He wrote to me, under cover of secrecy, to ascertain whether a postmaster would be permitted to make a political contribution! The Congressman explained that he interpreted the Cleveland order as prohibiting a postmaster from making a political contribution. In reply, I stated that a postmaster was not permitted to make assessments or to solicit money for political purposes, but that, should he desire to make a political contribution outside of his office, I could find no law or rule prohibiting him from so doing; that a postmaster, as well as any other Federal officer, had the right to light a cigar with his money, or give it to charity, or make any other use of it he desired, provided he did so in a proper man-

ner. The Civil Service Law is based upon both Governmental interests and the interests of the public service.

I cannot find language sufficiently strong to satisfy me in denouncing some of the conditions that existed in official life prior to the enactment of the Civil Service Law, when post-offices were made clearing-houses for political corruption, as well as assembling-points for political runners, and when drunkenness, corruption, and bad government lurked in the very official atmosphere,—in other words, when postmasters unflinchingly and without conscience or self-respect debased their offices and wielded their official power in the interests of political candidates. There has been a wide reformation, however, in official life since the enactment of the Civil Service Law; and I am glad to say that all of the more objectionable elements have been permanently eradicated. The worst charge I ever entertained against any post-office employee did not approach the improprieties that were common prior to 1886, and which existed to a large degree at the time President Cleveland issued his Proclamation, more than twelve years ago. I find that President Cleveland himself realized that conditions had changed in this respect within a decade; for in his Message sent to Congress in December, 1896, he said:

“While they [classified employees] should be encouraged to decently exercise their rights of citizenship and to support through their suffrages the political beliefs they honestly profess, the noisy, pestilent, and partisan employee, who loves political turmoil and contention, and who renders lax and grudging service to an Administration not representing his political views, should be promptly and fearlessly dealt with in such a way as to furnish warning to others who may be likewise disposed.”

I quote this, not so much to indicate that President Cleveland in 1896 must have realized that there no longer existed the necessity for an inflexible, rigid, and drastic enforcement of his order of 1886, as to show that he must have found that his order had been exaggerated in many respects, and a spirit engendered that he had not intended to create.

The Constitution of the United States itself is based upon the requirement of our citizens to exercise their political rights, and to take part in the discussions before the country, so that they may vote the more intelligently.

So much has been said about the famous order of President Cleveland, and so seldom have actual quotations from it been published, that the public and, especially, the Federal office-holders of the country have gotten far away from its letter and its spirit.

I have been repeatedly asked by men in the classified service in Washington whether it would be proper for them to go to their legal homes and register, with a view to voting at an election. Many of them have asked me whether they had the right to write political articles over their names and to take part in political discussions in the public prints. They added that they had interpreted the order of President Cleveland as forbidding any participation in political discussions or any expression of their partisan principles. In some quarters, I find, the Proclamation was so misconstrued, and the people were so ignorant of its actual text, that classified employees in the Federal service became nonentities. They lost almost all of their individuality as citizens, and were no more helpful in the selection of good men for high offices, in the purification of politics and society, and in the inception of good and wholesome laws, than were the denizens of the Fiji Islands.

It is the maximum, rather than the minimum, limit which may be attained by Federal employees in the exercise of political rights that lingers in my mind and frames my idea. I have repeatedly written, in reply to postal employees making inquiries along this line, that it was the manner in which they conducted themselves and exercised their political rights, rather than the exercise of them, which was in question; that I would not lay down a general rule forbidding and restraining the exercise of such rights, but that I preferred to take up individual complaints of improper action. A general rule would not fit all conditions and circumstances; and any such rule, when not at hand for the individual to consult, could be so misapplied and misinterpreted as to exercise as much evil as good.

As I interpret it, this position cannot be applied to the enforcement of general laws; for this is particularly a rule relating to a very delicate subject, and one requiring the exercise of honor, intelligence, and decency rather than having a single eye to the rigid requirement of the law. My entire thought is in the direction of encouraging the manly, proper, intelligent, and honest exercise of political freedom. I believe that letter-carriers and post-office clerks will be better carriers and better clerks through hearing political speeches, by attending primaries and conventions, and by going to the polls and voting. If a man did not attend church, nor hear a sermon, it would be very difficult for him to be saturated with religious thought. How can a man be intelligent and well-informed, and vote as a citizen who would do the best for his community and country, if he hears no speeches and never discusses political questions?

As there is a general lack of information as to the precise terms of the Civil Service Law and Rules relating to politics, I subjoin them here:

SECTIONS OF THE CIVIL SERVICE LAW RELATING TO POLITICS.

SEC. 11. That no Senator, or Representative, or Territorial Delegate of the Congress, or Senator, Representative, or Delegate elect, or any officer or employee of either of said Houses, and no executive, judicial, military, or naval officer of the United States, and no clerk or employee of any department, branch or bureau of the executive, judicial, or military or naval service of the United States, shall, directly or indirectly, solicit or receive, or be in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose whatever, from any officer, clerk, or employee of the United States, or any department, branch, or bureau thereof, or from any person receiving any salary or compensation from moneys derived from the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 1784, R. S. No officer, clerk, or employee in the United States Government employ shall at any time solicit contribution from any other officer, clerk, or employee in the Government service for a gift or present to those in a superior official position; nor shall any such officials or clerical superiors receive any gift or present offered or presented to them as a contribution from persons in Government employ receiving a less salary than themselves; nor shall any officer or clerk make any donation as a gift or present to any official superior. Every person who violates this section shall be summarily discharged from the Government employ.

SEC. 1546, R. S. No officer or employee of the Government shall require or request any workingman in any navy-yard to contribute or pay any money for political purposes, nor shall any workingman be removed or discharged for political opinion; and any officer or employee of the Government who shall offend against the provisions of this section shall be dismissed from the service of the United States.

CIVIL SERVICE RULES BEARING UPON PARTISAN POLITICS.

2. No person in the executive civil service shall use his official authority or official influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or controlling the result thereof.

3. No person in the executive civil service shall dismiss, or cause to be dismissed, or make any attempt to procure the dismissal of, or in any manner change the official rank or compensation of any other person therein because of his political or religious opinions or affiliations.

4. No question in any examination, or form of application, shall be so framed as to elicit information concerning, nor shall any inquiry be made concerning, nor any other attempt be made to ascertain, the political or religious opinions or affiliations of any applicant, competitor, or eligible; and all disclosures thereof shall be discountenanced. And no discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised, against or in favor of, any applicant, competitor, or eligible, because of his political or religious opinions or affiliations.

* * * * *

Fifth, that no person in the public service is for that reason under any obligation to contribute to any political fund, or to render any political service, and that he will not be removed or otherwise prejudiced for refusing to do so.

Sixth, that no person in said service has any right to use his official authority or influence to coerce the political action of any person or body.

SUMMARY OF POSITIONS, CLASSIFIED AND UNCLASSIFIED.

Number of persons classified in 1883 by the original Act.....	13,924
Inclusions or extensions by Republican Presidents.....	27,677
Inclusions or extensions by Democratic Presidents.....	27,892
Present number of classified positions in Federal Service.....	83,817
Unclassified positions.....	95,079

In the preparation of this article I have carefully consulted the Civil Service Law and Rules, as well as all of the information contained in the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission (July, 1896, to June 30, 1897), a volume containing more than five hundred closely printed pages, and embracing not only the Law, Rules, and Regulations, reports upon all of the principal cases considered during the year, and statistics relating to the Civil Service, but also copious extracts from the important decisions bearing directly upon the Service rendered by the courts during that fiscal year. I can find in none of these decisions any reference to President Cleveland's Proclamation of 1886, nor any reference whatever to the exercise of political liberties. The whole contention at present before the public is founded upon President Cleveland's order and the constructions that have been placed upon it. In the various Messages of the Presidents to Congress references have been made to the proper exercise of political rights, and classified employees have been repeatedly admonished to inform themselves upon the political issues and to maintain their franchise and exercise their citizenship. A careful perusal of the Civil Service Commission's Report should be made by all persons who discuss the Civil Service Law; for it is a volume of great interest, and will shed much light in dark corners.

If I may be permitted to advert to a point not quite pertinent to this discussion, I should like to refer to a statement in the last Report of the Civil Service Commission, which caused me some amusement, inasmuch as it bears upon a section of country whence have emanated some of the bitterest criticisms of my recent interpretations of President Cleveland's Civil Service Proclamation. In certain sections of Boston I have been charged with great disregard of Civil Service reform.

I find that during the past fiscal year the percentage of changes in the classified service of Boston was $2\frac{1}{5}$, as against $4\frac{3}{5}$ in New York; the latter representing the "spoils centre" of the country. In Boston during the same fiscal year the percentage of changes in unclassified Federal positions was $16\frac{3}{4}$ as against 10 in New York. The logic of this is that either the Civil Service Law is more faithfully enforced in Boston

than it is in New York, or that in the latter city the condition of the classified service is not so good as it is in Boston. The thought also arises that, while Boston is faithfully enforcing the Civil Service Law, it has its eyes wide open for spoils, and is even more eager than New York to secure positions on account of politics, inasmuch as Boston during the past year made $6\frac{3}{4}$ per cent more changes for political purposes in the unclassified service than did New York. It would also appear that the only restraint Boston has in securing office for partisan purposes is the law.

Pernicious activity or offensive partisanship are terms in themselves broad or narrow. They may mean much or may mean little: it all depends upon the construction placed upon them. In making complaint it is necessary to specify as to real or alleged infraction. That which may seem one thing to you may mean another thing to your neighbor. President Cleveland did not interpret. He did not specify. He may have meant much, or, on the other hand, he may have had little in his mind. His subsequent statements, and the orders of his subordinates, do not indicate any desire to disfranchise his office-holders. I believe his object was to exhort in behalf of fairness, decency, and moderation, and that even in that day of immature Civil Service reform he had no thought of curtailing the fair and proper exercise of political freedom.

In his reference to the control of primaries Mr. Cleveland undoubtedly had in view the old, disgraceful, and corrupt exercise of official power. He was too practical a politician not to realize that, as an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, a little intelligent and proper exercise of personal influence before and at the primary was worth any amount of energy at the election. When nominations have once been made, there is little left for the personal influence of the citizen. If one party is guilty of corruption, the other party is generally guilty. If pure citizenship is to count for anything, it should antedate Election Day. "Go out and exert yourself before the primary or the nominating convention: don't wait till Election Day," is an injunction as old as political procedure, and as wise as old. President Cleveland undoubtedly had no thought of saying to a postmaster or other Federal employee, "If you believe a candidate for nomination to office is an impure or incompetent person, you shall neither say nor do anything to defeat his nomination." He unquestionably had in mind only the means that might be pursued by the office-holder to defeat the nomination of an objectionable candidate. If this was his purpose, could there be any objection to permitting office-holders, in their private capacities, decently

and inoffensively to participate in nominations? If this was not his object, will any reasonable man gainsay that Mr. Cleveland was wrong?

All that any of us want—if we are law-abiding, self-respecting, good citizens—is good government, purity in office, and efficient public service. It must be presumed, as a premise to this controversy, that men already in office, especially those within the classified service, are deeply interested in the result. An efficient, capable, honest, fair, and effective service is the only one that will last; and those in it—barring, of course, a few subservient employees—can hope to succeed only by maintaining these characteristics. Are we not to proceed upon the theory that men in office, with the knowledge of the retribution visited in the past upon improper characters, have some sense of decency and propriety, and that they have in constant view self-preservation? My argument is that we are so far beyond the age of low “bummerism” in Federal office that we can afford to hesitate and ask ourselves, “Have we not gone far enough in proscribing citizenship in office? Have we not sufficiently restrained personal and political liberties to admit of free thought and of the free exercise of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution? Cannot we carry this matter of proscription so far as to do citizenship and the Republic more harm than good?” We have eliminated machine politics from Federal positions. We have restricted activity in partisanship to proper conduct. Is it not better to bend at times, like the willow before the storm, than to stand upright like the oak and be uprooted?

A minority can never hope to become a majority except by winning over some from the majority. One must be patient in all reforms. Civil Service reform has made wonderful strides, considering the reprehensible systems and practices in vogue when the Law was passed.

I can never forget the injunction of Grant, “If you think the law is unjust, enforce it: the people will do the rest.” It will also be recalled that he added, “If you don’t like a law, enforce it rigidly.” My idea is that we should have some patience and a great deal of consideration in enforcing the law of which I am speaking. Injustice and dishonor, as well as justice and good, may be committed in its name and under its authority. The future and not the present merely must be kept in view. A near-sighted captain should never be placed on the bridge.

PERRY S. HEATH.

THE RELATION OF JAPAN TO OTHER NATIONS.

FORTY-FIVE years ago Commodore Perry's squadron anchored in the Bay of Yedo. Five years later Townsend Harris concluded at Yedo the treaty which became the basis of Japan's conventional relations with Western nations. On July 17, 1899, those relations will be revolutionized. New treaties will then go into operation which will restore to Japan all the prerogatives of national sovereignty now in abeyance, and will open the whole Empire to foreign travel, trade, and residence. One important change will take place even earlier, viz., on January, 1, 1899, when the Japanese Government will assume control of the customs.

The significance of these facts needs no emphasis. In less than fifty years from Perry's time, Japan, which was then virtually *terra incognita* will stand on a footing of equality with Western nations! It may not be uninteresting to note some of the causes which have led to this result, so unique in the intercourse of Occidental and Oriental peoples.

When Commodore Perry planned his expedition Japan had been closed to the world for more than two centuries. Restricted commercial relations were tolerated with one European nation, but on terms so rigorous and humiliating that the wonder is that even the most robust greed for gain could have stomachached them. The Empire was seemingly impervious to advances from without. Commodore Perry, however, showed that he understood the situation better than most of his contemporaries. He argued—we can now see how justly—that Japan's condition was the result of extraordinary, and not of natural, causes. In confirmation of this view he pointed to the fact that the Japanese were an energetic and enterprising people, who, before their country was closed, had carried their commerce and arms far abroad. Not even the strange and unnatural seclusion to which the nation had been so long subjected had been sufficient, in his opinion, to obliterate its strength and virility. In the civilization then existing and in the development of the arts, industries, and agriculture, he perceived promise of progress under more favorable circumstances.

It was fortunate for Japan that such a man should have undertaken

the task of bringing her into touch with the Western world. It was no less fortunate that the work which Perry began so successfully should have been taken up by a man like Townsend Harris, the first American Minister to Japan. Able and conscientious, firm yet tolerant, and possessing a wonderful intuitive knowledge of Japan and the Japanese, Townsend Harris may be regarded as one of the most noteworthy figures in the annals of Eastern diplomacy. Alone, and unaided by even the semblance of force, amid difficulties which would have dismayed one less patient and sagacious, he negotiated a treaty which was a model of moderation, and in so doing set an example which the envoys of other countries following him had perforce to imitate.

The years immediately succeeding the conclusion of these early treaties were fraught with momentous consequences for Japan. The Empire was rent by internal dissensions; and in a brief time the Shogunate, after two centuries of undisputed control, tottered to its fall. The changes which then came, one after the other, with such bewildering rapidity are too well known to be recapitulated here. The nation was stirred by impulses and aspirations thitherto undisclosed. Reforms were undertaken with a zeal and energy that sometimes seemed to border upon over-confidence. The criticism was frequently heard in those early days that Japan was "going too fast"; and it cannot be gainsaid that there appeared at times to be very plausible reasons for the belief. The result has proved, however, that, on the whole, moderation, with a correct comprehension of the capacities of the people, was the keynote of Japanese progress. The most important reforms have already passed the experimental stage. The rest may be safely left to the process of natural development. Without assuming the *rôle* of a prophet, I venture to say that retrogression is an impossibility. Confirmation of this assertion, it seems to me, is to be found in the fact that the most important progressive movements in Japan have been due not to accident nor to haphazard effort, but to intelligent and patient endeavor.

The approaching transformation in the Empire's treaty relations, to which allusion has already been made, is an excellent illustration of this statement. The radical changes in Japan's condition after the Restoration convinced the Government that some modification of its treaties was desirable. Such a modification was provided for in the Townsend Harris Treaty; but, by subsequent agreements not nearly so liberal and by a one-sided interpretation of treaty stipulations to which for the time being Japan could offer no effective resistance, the changes were postponed. As long ago as 1871 an embassy was sent

abroad for the purpose of persuading the Treaty Powers to agree to a revision, but with no result. The question then remained in abeyance until 1882, when the situation became such that some action seemed to be imperatively demanded. For one thing, the fiscal necessities of the Empire made a change in existing tariff arrangements most desirable. For another,—and this was an even more important consideration,—the growth of foreign intercourse rendered the further closing of the whole country to foreign trade and residence both difficult and anomalous. Railways and other improved means of communication were rapidly bringing the Treaty Ports into close touch with all parts of the Empire. Evidently foreign enterprise could not be much longer confined to the limits fixed by treaty; and yet the Japanese Government could never consent to the extension of consular jurisdiction throughout the Empire, which the effacement of those limits would entail. It was apparent that some effort must be made to harmonize the treaties with existing conditions; and for that purpose a conference with all the Treaty Powers was held at Tokio in 1882. After deliberations extending over several months the conference adjourned without having reached a final agreement. Another conference, convened in 1885, ended practically in the same manner.

These attempts cannot, however, be fairly regarded as failures. In fact, they served a most useful purpose; for, while neither of them resulted in an immediate revision of the treaties, each marked a distinct advance in that direction. They convinced the Treaty Powers, on the one hand, of the sincerity and earnestness of Japan's desire for revision; while, on the other, they showed the Japanese Government what steps had to be taken to attain that end. The improvement of the judiciary, the revision and codification of the laws, and other cognate reforms which have marked Japan's progress, are not due directly to the desire to improve her treaty relations. They were a part of the general advance movement which began at the time of the Restoration. But there can be no doubt that reforms of this character were stimulated by the hope of placing the Empire on a more equal conventional footing with Western nations. The relations of the two movements at various stages are significant.

In 1882 Japan asked only for a revision of the tariff convention and for some arrangement which would ensure the ultimate disappearance of consular jurisdiction. In 1885 the progress made in judicial and legal reforms enabled the Government to enlarge those demands. So, also, in the separate negotiations with the Powers which ensued,

each proceeded upon broader lines, owing to the closer approach of Japan's legal system to Western standards, until in 1893, when the final negotiations were begun, the Government was able to ask for the total abolition of consular jurisdiction, because when the new treaties went into effect the Treaty Powers would have the guarantee of accomplished facts in complete codes of law in successful operation, and in an educated and independent judiciary.

Evidences of intelligent foresight and of wise precaution can also be discovered in the inception of another most important reform; viz., the adoption of a constitutional form of government. To many this appeared at the time to be a hazardous experiment; although it was admitted to be the logical result of circumstances attending the resumption of the Imperial power in 1867. Every one knew that the promise then made by the Emperor would be fulfilled in due season; but, in the opinion of even some of the leading men of Japan, it seemed better to defer fulfilment for a time. The surrender of a portion of the Imperial prerogatives, which it involved, was wholly voluntary; the time, the manner, and the scope being dependent entirely upon the Emperor's will. Experience has shown, however, that this important step was not prematurely taken,—a result due in no small measure to the wise and prudent forethought with which all the details were arranged.

The change was not made instantaneously, but after formal notice allowing time for careful preparation. Nor was it attempted to settle off-hand all of the questions to which the introduction of liberal institutions would naturally give rise. Something was left to practical experience and to natural development. The manner of dealing with the question of government by party is an instance in point, and one to which recent events in Japan give especial significance. There has been a difference of opinion on this subject from the outset,—one party contending that the Cabinet is responsible to the Emperor alone; the other, that it is accountable to the Diet also, and, by natural implication, to the predominant parliamentary party. The constitution itself leaves the matter in some doubt,—purposely so, there is good reason to believe,—the object being neither to establish nor to interdict government by party, but to remit the decision to the operation of natural causes. In any case there is abundant provision for the orderly conduct of public affairs in all contingencies; and it speaks well for the capacity of the Japanese people for the measure of self-government granted to them, that in all the parliamentary crises to which this and cognate questions have given rise there has been no interruption of the

proper administration of government in accordance with law. Nothing reactionary or revolutionary has marred the Constitutional era in Japan.

What is more, the representatives of the people have shown in emergencies the capacity to sink their prejudices and to rise above party dissensions. The loyal, unanimous, and unquestioning support given to the Government during the war with China by a Diet the majority of whose members were not politically the friends of the Cabinet, apart from the credit it reflects upon Japanese patriotism, affords valuable assurance of the stability of liberal institutions in Japan. Let no one suppose, therefore, when reading about parliamentary struggles in Japan, that the Empire is approaching the danger-line, or that good government is imperilled. The Japanese are merely working out for themselves, by legitimate means and through the medium of practical experience, one of the great problems of public administration; and, whatever temporary inconveniences may result, there is no valid reason to fear for the future.

The intellectual and material development of Japan within the past three decades is familiar to all. International and political questions have by no means absorbed the attention of her people. There has been progress in many other directions,—an eager search for knowledge, with an earnest desire to utilize the agencies of modern civilization. The result is gratifying; although no true friend of Japan will claim that nothing remains to be done. With all the changes which this period of transition has produced, it is only natural that some relics of the nation's unique past should survive. That past could not but have left a strong impress; but the people have shown such capacity and such adaptability that it is not unreasonable to expect that any incongruities which at present exist will in time disappear, or be moulded into harmony with their new environment.

To no nation is the growth of this strong and progressive Power in the East of greater moment than to the United States. The latter country, by its liberal and enlightened policy, has earned the confidence and esteem of the Japanese Government and of the Japanese people. Townsend Harris, who set the example of just and honorable dealing, has had worthy successors. It must be acknowledged, however, that American interest in Japan has hitherto been to some extent sentimental. Now, however, the American people are beginning to realize that the relations of the two countries have a most important practical bearing upon the interests of the United States. Even before the stirring

events of the recent past drew the attention of the whole nation to the Pacific, it was evident that Japan's commercial and industrial development made her a factor of great consequence in the extension of American commerce. During the past few years trade between the United States and Japan has advanced in volume and value by great strides. The products and industries of each country supplement those of the other; and the future gives promise to both of substantial benefit from the continued development of commercial intercourse.

If this was true six months ago, how much more forcibly can it be said to-day, when the United States is about to assume a new position and new responsibilities in the East. This is a topic upon which I must touch with some reserve; but there is no harm in saying that the whole tone of public utterance in Japan shows that the Japanese people contemplate the acquisition of the Philippine Islands by the United States with cordial approval. They themselves have important commercial interests in the Islands, for the protection and increased prosperity of which they find ample promise in American control. But, what is even more, they welcome a neighbor against whom they need erect no safeguards, and whose interests in the Far East are practically identical with their own. I am not now hinting at an alliance: that we know would be foreign to the policy of both countries. The United States and Japan have, however, the same deep concern in the unrestricted development of commerce in the Far East; and now that the United States is about to enter a sphere where no rival holds by right a higher place, and yet where America has so long permitted others to take the lead, public opinion in Japan regards the step as an added guarantee against the usurpation by any Power of any part of a field of enterprise where all are entitled to compete.

So much for Japan's attitude. On the part of the United States it is to be hoped there will be the same candid recognition of the importance of mutual interests. Thus far no divergence of opinion has even momentarily interrupted the cordial relations of the two countries. The Hawaiian incident is happily closed, and Japan has cheerfully acquiesced in the result; feeling assured that the rights which her Government sought to conserve will not suffer because of the frank and friendly interchange of views which occurred on the subject of annexation. An attempt was made during the pendency of that question to prejudice the people of this country against Japan on account of Japanese emigration to Hawaii. The motive was as obvious as unjustifiable. The Japanese as a race are not an emigrating people. Hawaii

has received by far the largest number of Japanese emigrants who ever went abroad to any one country ; and it can hardly be claimed that thirty thousand people at most, within a period of twelve years, is a large proportion of emigrants out of a population of over forty millions.

Moreover, this emigration took place under unusual circumstances, through the desire and the direct intervention of the Hawaiian Government, and in accordance with specific treaty stipulations. I only mention the subject in this place because it has been attempted in some quarters to prove, from the example of Hawaii, that the United States is in danger from Japanese immigration. No assertion could be more mischievously incorrect. There is nothing in Japanese immigration to this country which offers the slightest menace. It has always been small ; and there is no prospect of an increase either in the near or the remote future. Agitation on the subject has, consequently, no reasonable foundation, and can serve no useful purpose. Japan asks for her people in this country no rights that are not accorded to other strangers ; and the effort to represent that their presence is harmful to the interests of Americans can only be regarded as the expression of narrow and selfish views. It cannot be reasonably feared that such views will ever find definite expression in American public policy. Self-interest, if nothing else, would prevent that. The Government and the people of the United States have always shown that they appreciated the friendship of Japan. Now that the nation stands on the verge of one of the most important crises in its history, and when it is about to enter upon a career which will make closer relations with Japan not so much a choice as a necessity, there can be no danger of such a mistake as the needless sacrifice of that friendship. The friends of Japan have no fear on that account ; feeling confident that the relations of the two peoples will in the future be even more cordial, if that be possible, than in the past.

New Japan, the nation about to enjoy the fruition of labors and sacrifices which this country has done so much to lighten, and the United States, planting its flag for the first time on distant shores, have much to gain by mutual trust and helpfulness. And not only they, but others weaker than themselves may profit by their friendship. The example of two such nations presenting a firm front to aggression may very well serve as a warning to others less scrupulous in a part of the world where so much is heard of aggression. D. W. STEVENS.

THE EDUCATED NEGRO AND MENIAL PURSUITS.

THIRTY years have passed since the Negro was made a freeman and a citizen. In these years he has demonstrated to the world at large that he has mental capacity sufficient to cope with a rigid curriculum of studies; that he has industry amounting to thrift, as shown by the Census statistics of the wealth of the colored population; that he is fully as law-abiding as the rest of mankind, not prone to indulge in strikes, to join mobs, to incite riots or become either anarchist or socialist; that he is both brave and patriotic; in short, that while he is by no means a saint, neither is he the worst element of the nation.

Although this has been proved by figures that cannot be disputed, yet questions about the race are constantly arising. The truth is that, in some form or other, the Negro is ever in the public eye. There is one question, however, that confronts the student of economics and sociology,—the question relating to the means by which a livelihood is earned by the educated colored man or woman;—and while this, too, has many sides, one particular phase of it so presents itself that other phases are lost sight of. Still there is an inter-relation that will not admit of discussion of this phase without incidentally at least referring to others.

The particular question may be and is put squarely in this form: "Why is it that so many young colored men and women, after having acquired a high-school or college education, follow menial pursuits?" The question is pertinent, as in fact are all questions which touch a truth. This one is broad as well as pertinent. It cannot afford to be ignored. It suggests much that has to do with the position of the race before the world. It raises many other questions that reach out along several lines of life. It indicates that, despite unparalleled progress in many ways, the race must be perpetually on guard.

But let us see, first of all, whether there is such a broad basis of fact as the question would indicate. Is it really the educated Negro, the graduate, that is found so largely in menial pursuits? A reasonable doubt may be thrown upon the implied assertion, by a reference to some statistics. Taking up the catalogues of two institutions which may be said to represent most fairly Negro higher education and its results, we

find in one,—a college in the North largely controlled by colored men and largely taught by colored teachers,—the following facts; viz., out of three hundred graduates from courses ranging from normal, through theological, scientific, and classical, not more than twelve are known to have followed menial pursuits. These graduates are teachers, ministers, secretaries, in the employ of the Government as diplomats, chaplains, post-masters, clerks, mail-carriers, etc., or taking post-graduate courses; while many of the girls are mistresses of their own homes. In the other catalogue, representing a leading school for the race in the South, out of one hundred and fifty graduates not one is found who is in any position other than one far removed from menial occupation. Though without actual statistics before me regarding other schools, yet my personal knowledge of many is such that I feel safe in saying that the proportion of their graduates returning to menial pursuits is at any rate no greater than that found in the institutions I have cited.

There is another view which may be taken of the matter. It is doubtless true that many a graduate desiring to study for a particular profession, or to pursue higher courses, finds himself where the state of his exchequer will not allow him to proceed. Then, for the end in view, the quickest, easiest way for him to replenish it is by some work he knows how to do, which will bring ready returns, and to which he need not be bound longer than to satisfy these needs. It is no reflection on the colored youth that those ways are largely menial: it is simply a reflection on the civilization that holds him so largely to such ways. But that is another topic, which we shall reach in answering the basic question. In such a course the colored boy or girl is not alone; as we find even the poor white boy or girl doing the same at times, though not nearly so often, because of this very civilization to which I have referred. But a careful study will show that the colored youth—no more than the white youth who has such an end in view—does not remain wedded to such pursuits. The writer knows of one recent case that may be taken as a typical one in respect to the Negro. A young medical graduate of a Northern first-class medical college turned his knowledge of the duties of a waiter to advantage at a large gathering in one of our leading cities, in order that he might provide himself with means to take him to Texas, where he purposes to practise his profession. We know he will succeed. No: the Negro boys and girls, as a rule, if found engaged in such pursuits, do not continue to follow them.

There is still another standpoint from which to look at this matter.

The colored youth knows and appreciates the value set upon education by the world at large, and especially by the cultured classes with whom he may be thrown in contact. The colored youth is charged with being imitative. Be that as it may, knowing and appreciating the value the world sets on education, there have been instances where he has posed in a borrowed character, and has practised imposition upon those whose short acquaintance with him would not render him liable to exposure. Knowing his public, he has taken an unfair advantage of the unwary philanthropist, or philosophical social economist, and has led him to think that the youth who has been wielding his razor, passing his soup, polishing his russets, carrying his valise, or sweeping the halls, is a graduate because he takes pains to let fall the statement that he "finished at Oberlin." Whether Oberlin *college* or *public school*, or what interpretation is to be placed upon the word "finished," is not always ascertained.

But let us return to our first question, and analyze the supposable situation upon which it is predicated. Thereby we may perhaps furnish an answer that shall at least vindicate the Negro from the charge that his higher education is a mistake, that it is not appreciated at its true worth, that he does not know what to do with it, and that he turns to the "flesh-pots" naturally.

On the hypothesis that the supposedly educated Negro youth does seek to be waiter, caterer, bellboy, porter, bootblack, newsboy, chambermaid, or what not, in the list of callings termed menial, is it a matter of choice or a matter of necessity? If it can be proved to be the former there can be but one view to take of the case; viz., that a thousand-dollar education has been wasted upon a ten-dollar boy or girl. In such a case no inner compelling force is in existence to make the subject mount higher. There is nothing to cause that one to "break the bar of invidious circumstance." There are in every race some such who may be prodded up and on, but in whom, when the prod is removed, lower tastes reassert themselves, the dust triumphs over the "divinity within," and the person sinks into the mire from which he was once raised.

But, if it is a matter of necessity, it is quite another thing. I take the stand that, so far as statistics and experience go to prove anything, the majority of such cases are pushed to this extremity by necessity. This is so far true that, taking it into consideration with all that it implies, it is not only a matter of curiosity to the thinking white man, but is a matter of the deepest perplexity and concern to every thoughtful mem-

ber of the colored race. It is a matter of moment as to how the colored educated girl or boy shall make a livelihood. It goes so far that even university-trained negroes, when facing the situation, look dubiously upon the long years spent in preparation, and ask themselves in hours of discouragement, "Cui bono?" When such a man, mentally equipped with the wealth of education, finds influence the most potent factor in obtaining recognition where he can put his talents to use; when he sees that fitness so frequently plays only a small part in obtaining positions which he has studied hard and faithfully to fill; that barter is not confined to business solely, he questions himself seriously, as he finds he must either turn to work from which he shrinks, or beg or starve. And here I may say that the colored beggar is seldom seen, as also is the colored tramp. Is it because the Negro prefers to work at anything rather than take up these *rôles*? And, if so, is he lazier than his white brother? These are questions well worth considering.

With the conviction that the situation of the educated Negro as a menial, when found in such a position, is most largely one of necessity, let us see why it is so. The Negro boy or girl who has pursued an educational course to completion is in the most literal sense thrown out into the world to sink or swim. Let us look at this world into which a colored youth is thrown. Let us contrast his condition with that of his white schoolmate, and see if we can find a reason for the necessity that confronts him at almost every turn.

Why does he not go into an office, learn his father's business, become a merchant, a business man of some sort, or a clerk. Why does he not lead a life of leisure? Why does he not find himself called to the editor's chair, to the presidency of a college, to a professorship, or to a diplomatic position? The colored youth teaches and preaches; but such positions are limited both in number and in scope. He must do something else. Few offices are open to him; and these are besieged. Sometimes he gets a place as clerk, secretary, typewriter, stenographer; more often the only vacancy for him is that of janitor or doorkeeper. He may perhaps study law; but that brings him no income unless he plays the part of the lawyer's office-boy while so studying. As to learning his father's business,—if, fortunately, his father has been able to provide for him thus far, it is usually the case that it has been at the cost of much self-denial on the part of the parent. The father seldom has a paying business into which he can take his son or daughter. When he has, the graduate does not take to menial work.

Again, to become a man of business calls for capital as well as brains;

but every educated man is not cut out for a business life. Inclination and adaptability are to be considered here as elsewhere. Travel is out of the question, as a rule, because of lack of means; and the same lack precludes the possibility of the Negro's living a life of scholarly leisure. Should he wield a brilliant, trenchant pen, he can expect his talents to find recognition only as he enters the army of reporters. This he does at times; but a chair in the editor's sanctum is seldom for him. Though he may be a graduate and a post-graduate, he cannot expect the presidency of any but a Negro college. The majority of such positions are held by white men; and the professorships follow largely along the same line. Only the inferior appointments—tutor, instructor, etc.—may possibly be his. The fact that he is a specialist, a post-graduate, makes little difference. The same holds true in regard to diplomatic positions: only minor appointments are his.

When it comes to considering the possibility of a life of leisure, what shall be said? One of luxurious idleness is, happily for the race, out of the question; and a negro tramp, as I have said, is a *rara avis*. As for the enforced idleness of a felon's cell, the fact is that the educated Negro is very seldom a criminal—"Smoking Flax" and such atrocious misrepresentations to the contrary notwithstanding. Unfortunately some are lazy; but the vice of laziness is not peculiarly the Negro's. If the Negro youth starts out in law or medicine or business he has an exceptionally uphill task. The conditions are, however, growing better in these lines; for the race has more confidence in men of its own color than it once had. The colored lawyer, editor, dentist, physician, and grocer are all better patronized than formerly. It is all a matter of growth; and until a certain healthy maturity comes there will be the blighting influence of discouragement.

These, then, are reasons why the educated Negro youth does not do the things that the educated white youth does so largely. If he becomes pessimistic and thinks it all a mistake—this education he has gained at such an expense of pains and time—and should turn to a trade as a last resort for a livelihood, he finds himself again balked. Trades-unions have shut their doors; and the Labor party has see-sawed so much on the question of his admittance that it is difficult to know where it stands. Here and there he may succeed in attaching himself to a master-workman who will give him work and teach him the trade; but this is the exception. Because of these conditions there are many who, seeing only this phase of life, make the unqualified assertion that the Negro was vastly better off during the Slavery régime, when the Negro master-

workman was no rarity. But there is light ahead in this respect. Such schools as Hampton and Tuskegee, with their magnificent equipment of industrial shops, are helping to solve this part of the problem. They will give the Negro the knowledge. He must then push out and compete for the work.

But the dark side of the situation is such that it has prompted many to propound other questions, though not always with the humanitarian motive: "Why waste higher education thus? Why not give the Negro industrial training exclusively? Why not give him a pick instead of Latin and Greek?" The answer is, that higher education is not wasted on the race, no matter what facts are found as to his condition brought about by his environment. These facts were, however, to be confronted at some time, and the situation thoroughly canvassed; necessitating careful thought as to how it might be rendered better. It is no more wasted than it would be on white boys and girls, some of whom, with similar advantages, follow pursuits more or less menial in character. It is not wasted, because, even if done from necessity, there is the hope of a future for other boys and girls—a future with better conditions, I prophesy, when the experiences of those enduring the hardships and discomforts of the present situation will be for the advantage of coming generations.

If life is not to be looked upon wholly as a bread-and-butter existence, as our greatest and best philosophers continually assert, there is to be noted the uplifting influence in that home where the educated Negro youth is to be found, though conditions may force the boy or girl into menial walks. That home is the better, the more refined, for the education of some of its members. The race realizes this. It is not pessimistic at heart, though the outlook at times seems gloomy. The people will continue to clamor for the higher education; and the educated porter will heroically help younger brothers and sisters to its advantages, in the hope that there will be found a footing for some one of them, though his own has not been made secure. It becomes an aspiration that is ennobling to the highest degree. Then, who shall say that the educated youth may not bring to his menial task, if found in it, something higher and better out of himself that will have both a subjective and an objective influence?

Though conditions exist that may force the youth into such positions, the case does not present an utterly hopeless aspect; and certainly no friend of the race should become so impressed by it as to find in it an argument against higher education for the Negro. The race must have

higher education, just as it must also have industrial training. But good judgment must be used. It does not follow that every boy should be forced into the ranks of higher education, any more than that every one should be taught a trade alone. President Edward C. Mitchell, of Leland University, in an address to the American Baptist Home Mission Society, in May, 1896, answered those who labor under such false impressions in the following words, which cover the whole situation:

"Let us teach him what our colleges and universities were founded to teach. Let us teach him the only thing left him to teach. Let us teach the only thing the Negro cannot do as well for himself. Let us teach the thing which the experience of ages and the matured judgment of all true educators have decided to be essential for the full development of manhood. Let us teach the Negro what he is and what he is as God made him in his physical and mental structure. Let us teach him what the world is that God has made for him, with all its elements and powers and forces, —in short let us give him such glimpses of the whole range of science as shall tax his powers to the utmost, while it takes the conceit out of him and brings him nearer to the supreme discovery of Socrates, that he knows nothing."

Let us continue to teach him thus, and trust to the broader views, the wider philanthropy, the higher civilization, to leave the avenues of life's higher work open to him as to others; and then, with justice done, let him rise or fall on his own merits,—his inclination or disinclination to do or to be. With no barriers erected, we should soon listen in vain for even the echo of the questions that the present conditions force upon us.

But, after all, with the knowledge that the whole trend of these thirty-odd years has been upward, and that there has been at least some growth in culture, refinement, wealth, and intellectual achievements, would it not be well to leave these lower walks of life and to ask, "How many of the educated Negroes are following the higher paths?" Would not this question be well worth an answer? Would not the answer be of greater value to the sociologist?

W. S. SCARBOROUGH.

JOURNALISM : ITS REWARDS AND OPPORTUNITIES.

ONE of the commonest of man's frailties is his tendency to disparage the profession or business which he has voluntarily chosen as a permanent occupation. The man who does not sooner or later become impressed with the notion that he might have achieved greater success in some calling other than the one he has chosen, is a man of exceptional solidity of temperament, or enjoys the rich blessing of having been endowed with but one talent and with the good sense to select the one vocation for which that talent fitted him. The tendency to depreciate one's vocation is, perhaps, more pronounced among journalists than in any other department of professional endeavor.

It is true that the pecuniary rewards of journalism are inadequate. The salaries are not commensurate with the exacting character of its daily requirements. Editorial and reportorial duties call for a high order of mental equipment, for uncommon versatility and initiative, and for unflagging continuity of interest and application. Journalism involves a greater mental strain than any other profession. But, while the inadequacy of its earnings is conceded, it is my belief that the value of journalism as a profession should not be measured solely by the salaries paid to writers or editors. A just estimate of journalism as a vocation must, in my opinion, comprehend a broader survey of its possibilities. One must take into account the numberless opportunities which it offers to young men of talent and attainments. As a stepping-stone to more profitable occupations, journalism may well claim the serious attention of educated and ambitious men.

That the tendency to depreciate journalism as a life vocation is most pronounced among those employed on the metropolitan newspapers, where salaries are most attractive, is doubtless due to the peculiar exactions imposed upon those who fill the columns of these journals. Journalism in the larger cities is certainly a prolific breeder of pessimists. It fosters the destructive and reactionary forces of human nature.

Unfortunately it is the business of some of the writers in a certain school of journalism to ridicule society, to lampoon hypocrisy, to jeer at conventionality, to expose pretenders, to uncover corruption, to demolish

idols, and—quite too often—to satirize the honest, the simple, or the pure. To follow a profession that makes such demands upon talent and genius, naturally tends toward the development of a sordid mind,—one that sees very little good in anything, especially in the profession which seems to require a highly developed faculty for discovering the bad qualities only of the human race. It is the character of these exactions, arising from a perverted conception of journalism, that induces members of the profession to indulge in frequent jeremiads over its alleged inadequacies of opportunity and compensation.

“Is journalism, *i.e.*, the work of collecting news, writing editorials, and furnishing correspondence for daily newspapers, worthy the serious attention of educated young men seeking a permanent occupation that will yield an income sufficient for present needs and the necessary provision for old age?” Mr. Avenel, in the *May Forum*, endeavors to prove the negative of this proposition by instituting comparisons which I regard as fundamentally fallacious. In supporting his contention, that journalism compares unfavorably, from the standpoint of pecuniary rewards, with other learned professions, Mr. Avenel commits the usual error of citing the professions of law and medicine, instead of the occupations that command fixed salaries. It is claimed by many, indeed, and with much reason, that journalism is not a profession; that it is a mercantile business, pure and simple. Under this classification, the actual writers, reportorial and editorial, could not be designated as journalists.

Without going into a discussion of the modern meaning of the word “journalism,” I think it will be generally conceded that the business of making newspapers has not yet advanced to that point where it may be properly characterized as a “learned profession,” in the sense that it requires a collegiate education or university training to practise it. No man can practise law, medicine, dentistry, or pharmacy in the State of Illinois without a permit from the State, which is issued only upon a diploma or other documentary proof that the applicant has received the requisite technical training at some institution maintained for the specific purpose. The man who should attempt to practise dental surgery without a permit from the State Board of Dental Surgery, or to practise medicine without a certificate from the State Board of Health, would be promptly arrested as a dangerous impostor. In the profession of law, admission to the bar is secured only after passing an examination which requires technical knowledge of the law and familiarity with court practice. It is a serious misdemeanor in most States to compound medicines without a certificate from the State Board of Pharmacy; and no

reputable druggist will employ a clerk who is not a registered pharmacist, or, in other words, is not a regular graduate of a school of pharmacy. Ordination to the ministry, in those denominations which have commanding influence in the Christian world, is also conditioned upon a high standard of scholastic attainment, as well as demonstrated proofs of consecration.

But the State imposes no conditions of scholastic attainment or technical knowledge upon the practice of journalism. The man who assumes the responsibility of moulding public opinion, of measuring the capacities of men, of discussing the problems of statecraft, science, society, or religion, recognizes no statutory restraints except the law of libel,—and even this can safely be disregarded in many States by journalists of no financial responsibility. The State requires no certification of moral or mental equipment for the practice of a profession which is capable of doing more harm to society and the State than any other calling in the whole wide range of human endeavor. A newspaper writer is not required, as a safeguard against poisoning or polluting the body politic, to graduate as a Doctor of Journalism.

No one denies the value of a collegiate education in the modern profession of journalism. It requires no argument to show that a profession which has for its field the entire domain of human thought has greater need of scholastic attainment and liberal culture than a vocation which imposes the limitations of a specialty. The wider the range of mental acquisition on the part of an editorial writer or reporter, the greater the facility for that embellishment and that diversification which enable a writer to lift his work above the commonplace, and thus to appeal to a constantly enlarging constituency of readers. While it is true, that the lack of that university literary training which enables a writer to enrich his daily productions with bright allusion and apt metaphor can be largely supplied by much reading and wide travel, there is little dissent among newspaper men from the general proposition that, while college training is not yet a *sine qua non* of success in modern journalism, it is a fact that such a preparation, combined with a natural aptitude for writing and with a certain amount of practical training in what is known as "newspaper style," supplies the best equipment for a first-class newspaper man. Journalism needs more college men. The percentage of college graduates among newspaper writers is now larger than at any previous time in the history of journalism, and is constantly on the increase. It is a fact, however, that many of the most brilliant writers and most capable all-round journalists in this country are not college

men; many of them having received nothing more than a high-school education.

Under these conditions, it is manifestly unfair and illogical to compare the rewards of the business of news-gathering and editorial writing with the earnings of the learned professions of law and medicine. A comparison of this kind will be allowable when the State surrounds the business of instructing and advising the common people with the same safeguards that are thrown around the professions of law, medicine, pharmacy, theology, dentistry, and pedagogy. So long as the State permits any political adventurer or irresponsible scribbler, without certificate of qualification, to practise journalism,—and thus to become a monitor of public ethics, an instructor of the people upon all questions affecting their political and moral obligations, and a purveyor of news that is sold with absolute disregard as to its effect upon the State, society, public sentiment, or private reputation,—it cannot be contended that such a calling is a learned profession.

Moreover, the salaries of newspaper writers are fixed. The method of compensation is the same as in stores or factories. The income of the lawyer or the doctor is governed by the extent of his practice. He hangs out his shingle; and his rewards, though generally commensurate with his talents, his training, his industry, and his success, are quite often more a matter of tactful advertisement of his capabilities than of superior professional skill. It would be just as fair to try to prove that bookkeeping is a very unattractive and unprofitable occupation, by citing the fact that the income of a good lawyer or physician is more than the salary of a bookkeeper. No man learns bookkeeping with the expectation of deriving from it an income equal to the earnings of a successful lawyer or doctor. Neither does anyone enter journalism with that expectation; although it is a fact that thousands of lawyers and doctors in the larger cities do not make as much as the salary of an editorial writer.

What are the opportunities of reward presented to educated young men by the profession of journalism? A proper point of view takes one outside the question of weekly stipends. Certainly no sane man enters journalism expecting to acquire a competency through the salary which he may command. The salary of the managing editor of the largest daily paper in America will not enable him to acquire property or provide against the future to any considerable extent. The same is true of nearly all other salaried positions. The possibilities of such a profession must not be measured by the contents of the pay-envelope.

In my opinion, the most attractive fields of profitable usefulness opened up by the pursuit of journalism are politics and the business of publishing. Those who have tried to show reasons why journalists should abstain from active participation in politics, and why they should refuse to enter the contests for public office, have never advanced an argument that will stand the test of logic or common sense. If a journalist, in the pursuit of his vocation, advocates certain governmental policies which may be embodied in the creed of a party, there is no reason why he should decline to accept a position that will enable him to have a part in the practical application of those policies when they are ratified by the people at the polls. The profession of journalism requires extended knowledge of politics and familiarity with the theory and practice of government. The successful journalist must of necessity be a constant student of national issues and party politics. He need not abandon the profession of journalism to enter a public service for which years of study and training have preëminently fitted him. Politics and journalism go together: they are inseparable. To say that politics is unworthy of the active participation of educated or literary men, is to say that the science of government should be turned over to men who are disqualified for the pursuit of any occupation requiring culture or mental attainment. To say that a profession which claims the prerogatives of criticism, as well as the right to suggest policies and create issues, should not be represented in the public service, is to contend that the man who frames the policies of a victorious party, and interprets the popular will upon public measures, is not to be trusted with the task of incorporating those policies into law, or with the enforcement of the popular decree after it has been registered in a constitutional manner.

As a matter of fact, the average journalist is better fitted for the public service than the representative of any other profession. There is no reason why politics or legislation should be regarded as the exclusive domain of the lawyer. There are a great many reasons why the business of lawmaking should not be entirely controlled by those who make money out of the practice of law. If public office disqualifies a journalist for impartial and fair-minded discussion of public measures, then the lawyer who is elected to Congress is disqualified from practice in any court. There is no reason why a journalist should expend the energies of a lifetime in helping men to secure public office, when he is himself better qualified, by experience, education, and training, for the public service than most politicians. The proverbial ingratitude of pol-

iticians should admonish newspaper writers that their surest hope of reward for party service is in active and aggressive participation in the contests for those places in the Federal service that are usually claimed by incompetents who have no especial fitness for them, and who have no claim upon the party, outside that which is established by corrupt manipulation of caucuses and conventions and which, to the disgrace of modern politics, is too often recognized.

Mr. George W. Smalley calls attention to the prominence of journalists in French politics. In the French Republic journalism appears to be a certain avenue to the responsibilities of statecraft and diplomacy. Nearly every Frenchman eminent in civil life since the Revolution began his career by writing for the press. Thiers, Guizot, and Gambetta were among the more notable French journalists who achieved distinction in politics.

While American journalists have been slow to appreciate and take advantage of their political opportunities, the last decade has witnessed a gratifying increase in the number of newspaper men in the public service. The Administration of President Harrison brought into the Federal service a larger number of trained and accomplished journalists than any previous Administration; and the Administration of President McKinley has evidenced an equally generous recognition of the men who, more than any others, were responsible for the "McKinley Movement" that swept over the country. President Harrison appointed as his private secretary Elijah Halford, then managing editor of the "Indianapolis Journal," a man of marked ability and ripe attainments, who had a singular gift for embodying State and national issues in party platforms. It was his pen that framed the forceful and striking appeal of the Indiana delegation in behalf of the nomination of Mr. Harrison. As a further recognition of the power and influence of the "Indianapolis Journal," Mr. Harrison gave its proprietor, Col. John C. New, the post of Consul-General at London, the best-paying office in the gift of our Government.

President McKinley followed the example of his Republican predecessor and appointed an eminent journalist, Mr. J. Addison Porter, proprietor and editor of the "Hartford Post," to a new office, that of "The Secretary to the President," now one of the most important positions in the gift of the National Executive. Although the present Administration is not yet two years old, the number of journalists drafted into executive, diplomatic, and consular positions is already large. Among them I recall the following: Charles Emory Smith, Postmaster-General; Perry

S. Heath, First Assistant Postmaster-General; J. L. Bristow, Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General; Frank H. Vanderlip, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; George E. Roberts, Director of the Mint; J. E. Wilkie, Chief of Secret Service; Wilbur F. Wakeman, Appraiser, New York; John K. Gowdy, Consul-General, Paris; Col. Chas. Page Bryan, Minister to Brazil; James Boyle, Consul, Liverpool; Rufus Fleming, Consul, Glasgow; W. P. Smyth, Consul, Hull, England; Col. W. R. Holloway, Consul-General, St. Petersburg; Oscar Durante, Consul, Catania, Italy; C. B. Hart, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Bogota, Colombia; Frank H. Mason, Consul-General, Frankfort, Germany; Francis B. Loomis, Minister to Venezuela; George G. Matthews, Consul, Para, Brazil; H. W. Diederich, Consul, Magdeburg, Germany; Major J. L. Bittinger, Consul-General, Montreal, Canada; Albion W. Tourgee, Consul, Bordeaux, France; John Hay, Secretary of State; Henry A. Castle, Auditor, Post-Office Department; and William Penn Nixon, Collector of the Port of Chicago. The appointment of Mr. A. D. Barlow as Consul-General at the City of Mexico was asked for by his brother-in-law, the publisher and editor of the "St. Louis Globe-Democrat"; and the appointment was made in recognition of the influence of that journal in the Southwest.

The late Major Moses P. Handy, who was appointed by the President as United States Special Commissioner to the Paris Exposition of 1900, was one of the best-known journalists in this country; while the appointment of Hon. Whitelaw Reid, of the New York "Tribune," to be the Special Representative of the President at the celebration of the Queen's Jubilee in London and, later, his appointment as a member of the Commission to arrange a treaty of peace with Spain, were most graceful and fitting tributes to the dignity and power of American journalism. I have no means at hand of ascertaining the number of journalists and newspaper writers who have been appointed postmasters under the present Administration; but the First Assistant Postmaster-General estimates that there are from three to five thousand. In second- and third-class offices, at least one-half of the postmasters are newspaper men.

After an experience of more than twenty-seven years in the newspaper business, and after having closely watched through twenty years of his life (about fifteen of which were spent at the national capital) the careers of many journalists, Mr. Perry S. Heath, the present First Assistant Postmaster-General, gives it as his opinion that "no man can rise higher through any channel than through the channels of journalism."

In the biographies of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, published from year to year in the "Congressional Directory," appear references to the fact that this or that Senator or Representative was at one time a printer or an editor. James G. Blaine always pointed to the fact that he had been a newspaper reporter, and then an editor, with greater pride than he did to any other in his history. Senators Gallinger, Hansbrough, Hawley, and possibly a dozen others in the upper branch of Congress, also take more pride in referring to their experiences at the printer's case, or the reporter's table, or the editor's desk, than to any other periods of their lives.

I am told that in the smoking-room of the lower House of Congress there frequently congregate fifteen or twenty Members, who regale one another with their early experiences as country or city editors, reporters, or type-setters. The same authority states that printers, reporters, editors, and newspaper publishers have furnished a larger percentage of successful public men than any other trade or profession, with the possible exception of the law. Further, that during the past quarter-century journalists have been among the very brightest and most influential of politicians and statesmen.

Congressman Amos J. Cummings, of New York, gives it as his opinion that a journalist succeeds easier in politics than in any other profession. Among the members of the Fifty-Fifth Congress who are now, or have been at some time in their lives, journalists or newspaper writers, may be mentioned: Representatives Willis Brewer, of the fifth Alabama district; Levin Irving Handy, of Delaware; Robert R. Hitt, of the ninth Illinois district; Charles B. Landis, of the ninth Indiana district; Samuel M. Clark, of the first Iowa district; George D. Perkins, of the eleventh Iowa district; Nelson Dingley, of the second Maine district; William E. Barrett, of the seventh Massachusetts district; Samuel J. Barrows, of the tenth Massachusetts district; Joel P. Heatwole, of the third Minnesota district; Charles F. Cochran, of the fourth Missouri district; Champ Clark, of the ninth Missouri district; Richard Bartholdt, of the tenth Missouri district; David H. Mercer, of the second Nebraska district; Amos J. Cummings, of the tenth New York district; George B. McClellan, of the twelfth New York district; Lemuel E. Quigg, of the fourteenth New York district; George N. Southwick, of the twentieth New York district; Rowland B. Mahany, of the thirty-second New York district; William R. Ellis, of the second Oregon district; James R. Young, of the fourth Pennsylvania district; Ernest F. Acheson, of the twenty-fourth Pennsylvania district; Freeman Knowles

and John E. Kelley, Representatives-at-large from South Dakota; Walter P. Brownlow, of the First Tennessee district; Henry R. Gibson, of the second Tennessee district; E. W. Carmack, of the tenth Tennessee district; Sydney P. Epes, of the fourth Virginia district; Jacob Yost, of the tenth Virginia district; also Senators Hansbrough, of North Dakota, Hawley, of Connecticut, and Pritchard, of North Carolina.

This list might be extended by the addition of the names of hundreds of journalists who have been prominently identified with State and municipal politics; but those already given will suffice to demonstrate the capacity of newspaper men for all departments of the public service.

If it be true that the future of journalism as a profession for men of literary taste is menaced by the increasing domination of the counting-room, I see no reason why the man who is broadly equipped for newspaper work should not turn his attention to the counting-room. If the publishing and advertising departments of the business offer the greatest promise of adequate rewards for mental application and journalistic knowledge, the resourceful newspaper writer can soon find a way to enter those fields of activity. I do not accept the stereotyped contention that continuous service in editorial or reportorial departments disqualifies a man for the commercial branches of journalism. If a newspaper writer improves his rare opportunities for fellowship and for wide contact with men in all departments of professional and industrial activity, there is no reason why he should not turn the experience and knowledge thus acquired to profitable account as a publisher or advertising manager. In the cities of, say, 20,000 to 50,000 population, the successful journalist must of necessity be an all-round newspaper man, thoroughly familiar with all the departments. He is generally able to talk advertising, to write advertising, and, if necessary, to turn out a column of editorial matter on short notice. He must be able to preside at a political convention, to make a good speech when occasion demands it, and to hold his own against the persistent advertising agencies which make continuous and ingenious assaults upon his advertising rates. To do all this successfully, requires versatility of talent, incomparable tact, and an unflinching faculty for gauging all sorts and conditions of men. The departmental writer or editor on the metropolitan press is generally deficient in this training; but even he is not debarred by any inexorable law from ceasing to be a writing automaton.

The ambition to become a publisher is as legitimate for the editorial writer or reporter as is the ambition of the prescription clerk to become

a general pharmacist. The income of the publisher is dependent upon the extent to which he can market his wares. He is a trader in the product of the brains of journalists. His business is to buy the product of editorial and reportorial industry, to put them on raw paper, and to sell the combined commodities at a profit. If the work of furnishing brains for newspapers becomes unprofitable, let the writers invade the commercial branches of journalism and become buyers and sellers.

If the Goths and Vandals of the counting-room destroy the *prestige* and profit of the writing end of the business, it will be the fault of the writers themselves. There is no reason why the man who daily fills the editorial and reportorial columns of a newspaper should obscure his personality behind that of the publisher. If this is contrary to the ethics of modern journalism, it is time the code was changed. The man who writes should assert himself. He should not become a literary recluse or an editorial scullion. He should cultivate men of affairs, and get in touch with the people. The men who do the writing have the power to be at the front in all lines of journalistic endeavor. If they hesitate to wield it, the profession of newspaper writing will soon cease to have any attractions for men of culture and literary attainments, and will be turned over entirely to hack writers and penny-aliners.

The features of modern journalism which conspire to repel men of education and individuality are the tendencies toward impersonalism and "padding." The "blanket-sheets," which are padded with sensational stories, not only vitiate the public taste, but create a demand for the work of the hack writer, who writes for ridiculously small compensation. The average price for the stuff which fills the padded pages of the Sunday editions is seldom over \$6 a column, a sum that could hardly command the services of men who have enough mental equipment to write anything worthy of the serious attention of intelligent people.

We need a renaissance of the old-time journalism, which was the clarion voice of vigorous personality. Impersonalism means irresponsible journalism. Irresponsible newspaper writing means decadence of power and the gradual decline of a profession that should be paramount in its range of influence over all human endeavor. Every editorial and every article in a newspaper should be signed by the writer. The people who read newspapers should be able to identify every editorial utterance with a robust and potential personality which stands for the best attainment in some particular department of knowledge. This means individualization and specialization, both indispensable elements in any

line of successful professional endeavor. The lack of these essential elements of responsibility is the cause of the decline of the modern newspaper in its influence upon the people, particularly in politics and legislation. Unless journalism is saved from mercenary impersonalism, it must ultimately degenerate into a mere bargain-counter sale of advertising space and irresponsible narratives of daily events.

It is safe to presume that the man who enters journalism as a permanent occupation does so because he has ideas and convictions, and believes that he has a natural aptitude for expressing them in the kind of English that is adapted to the requirements of the modern newspaper. In other words, he adopts journalism not as a commercial or financial venture, but as an intellectual calling. There is more money in the manufacture of chewing-gum than there is in the profession of journalism. There is also more money in the manufacture of pills than in the practice of medicine; but the great discoveries in surgery and therapeutics were not made by the jobbers in pills. We must survey the opportunities and rewards of journalism from a higher point of view than the weekly pay-roll. In the scope of its activities; in the expanse of its field of political attainment; in the richness of those compensations that come from a realization of the power to exalt virtue, to uncover hypocrisy, to expose fraud, to redress wrong, to promote justice, to encourage high thinking, and to touch humanity in all its impulses, aspirations, and achievements, the profession of journalism is incomparable among the vocations of men.

TRUMAN A. DE WEESE.

RECENT CONSTRUCTION OF THE FEDERAL ANTI-TRUST ACT.

ON July 2, 1890, an Act was passed by the Congress of the United States, entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," which has since been known as the Anti-Trust Act. It provides that

"every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal."

The only authority of Congress to legislate upon this subject is found in the constitutional provision that it shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States. Unless, therefore, a contract, combination, or conspiracy restrains commerce with foreign nations or among the several States, or, as it is briefly described, interstate commerce, it is not within the prohibition of this Act. The statute has no relation to transactions within the boundaries of an individual State.

This rule was applied in 1894 by the Supreme Court in a suit brought by the Government under the Act.¹ By absorption of numerous other companies, a corporation had secured control throughout the country of the manufacture of refined sugar. It was claimed that this was a combination or conspiracy in restraint of interstate commerce, because it was contemplated that the refined sugar should be sold in States other than those in which it was produced. But the court held, with but one member dissenting, that the question where the sugar would ultimately be shipped was of no importance: the acquisition by this corporation of sugar refineries was merely an act done within the State where they were located, and not an act in restraint of interstate commerce, although it might indirectly affect such commerce. As the court pointed out, if that circumstance alone brought transactions within the national power, the National Government would control, to the exclusion of the States, substantially everything impor-

¹ United States *vs.* E. C. Knight Co., 156 U. S., 1.

tant in business operations and affairs. On the contrary, the court said, contracts, combinations, or conspiracies to control domestic enterprise in manufacturing, agriculture, mining, or production in all its forms, or to raise or lower prices or wages are not within the prohibition of the statute, although they may tend to restrain external as well as domestic trade. Congress did not attempt to limit and restrict the rights of corporations created by the States, or the citizens of the States, in the acquisition, control, or disposition of property, or to regulate or prescribe the price or prices at which the property or the products thereof shall be sold.

In construing this identical statute the court, therefore, held, in accordance with rules which have long been settled, that the various processes of production are antecedent to and distinct from interstate commerce; that commerce begins after production has terminated, and when the product "commences its final movement from the State of its origin to the State of its destination."¹ Restraint of this is the thing and the only thing which is prohibited by the Act of Congress.

In the case of the Trans-Missouri Freight Association,² decided in 1897, the court considered what contracts or combinations affecting interstate commerce were within this prohibition. The subject-matter involved was an agreement among a large number of railroad companies for the purpose of "establishing and maintaining reasonable rates, rules, and regulations on all freight traffic" of the parties, and containing provisions for accomplishing this purpose by their joint action. It was urged in support of the agreement that the statute was to be construed as prohibiting merely *unreasonable* restraint of trade or commerce, and that, as the agreement involved was reasonable, it was not unlawful. While some illustrations in the opinion seemed in a measure to yield to this view, still the court declined to recognize generally the reasonableness of a contract or combination in restraint of interstate commerce as the test of its lawfulness. It held that the prohibitory provisions of the Act apply to all contracts in restraint of interstate or foreign trade or commerce without exception or limitation, and are not confined to those in which the restraint is unreasonable.

These results had the approval of a bare majority of the court; while the minority expressed the view that the statute applied only to unreasonable restraints of trade.

The case of the Joint Traffic Association, decided upon October 24,

¹ *Coe vs. Errol*, 116 U. S., 517; *United States vs. E. C. Knight Co.*, 156 U. S., 1, 14. ² *United States vs. Trans-Missouri Freight Association*, 166 U. S., 290.

454 RECENT CONSTRUCTION OF THE FEDERAL ANTI-TRUST ACT.

1898, involved an agreement among a number of railroad companies "to establish and maintain reasonable and just rates, fares, rules, and regulations on State and interstate traffic," and for various purposes. The agreement differed in some respects from that contained in the case of the Trans-Missouri Association; but the court held that the differences were without importance.

In support of the agreement it was contended, among other things, that the Act, as construed in the Trans-Missouri case, was unconstitutional. The argument urged in that regard may be briefly stated. The power to regulate commerce granted to Congress by the Constitution is subject to the provision of that instrument that no person shall be deprived of liberty or property without due process of law. That provision secures to all persons freedom in the pursuit of their vocations and the use of their property, and in making such contracts or arrangements as may be necessary therefor; and this constitutional right can be limited by the legislative branch of the Government only in so far as may be required by the security or welfare of society generally. It is settled by conclusive authority that the mere fact that a contract restrains trade does not render it prejudicial to the security or welfare of society; the fact of such restraint alone, therefore, does not authorize Congress to limit the constitutional rights of liberty and property by prohibiting contracts of that character. In the Trans-Missouri case the court held that this Act of Congress applies to all contracts in restraint of interstate or foreign commerce without exception or limitation and without regard to whether they are reasonable or unreasonable. The Act is, therefore, merely an arbitrary declaration of the will of Congress that, irrespective of any considerations of the welfare or security of society, contracts of a lawful character shall be lawful no longer. As this is beyond the power of Congress, the statute violates the constitutional guaranty that no person shall be deprived of liberty or property without due process of law.

It was urged, in aid of this argument, that the effect of construing the statute as prohibiting all contracts in restraint of trade without exception or limitation would be to bring within its prohibition the great majority of business contracts or combinations, inasmuch as they restrain trade in some degree. As illustrations were suggested all organizations of mechanics engaged in the same business for the purpose of limiting the number of persons employed in the business, or of maintaining wages; the formation of a corporation to carry on any particular line of business by those already engaged therein; a contract of partner-

ship or employment between two persons previously engaged in the same line of business; the appointment of the same person by two producers to sell their goods on commission; the purchase by one wholesale merchant of the product of two producers; the lease or purchase by a farmer, manufacturer, or merchant of an additional farm, manufactory, or shop; a sale of the goodwill of a business with an agreement not to destroy its value by engaging in similar business; and a covenant in a deed restraining the use of real estate.

The court recognized the validity of the constitutional rules above stated. It met the argument, however, by saying that contracts or combinations such as those mentioned had never been regarded as "within any legal definition" of action in restraint of trade; adding that

"the Act of Congress must have a reasonable construction, or else there would scarcely be an agreement or contract among business men that could not be said to have, indirectly or remotely, some bearing upon interstate commerce and possibly to restrain it."

The court said, further, that the effect of the decision in the *Trans-Missouri* case was not to render contracts or combinations illegal merely because they restrained trade in some remote or indirect degree; that the statute applies only to those contracts whose direct and immediate effect is a restraint upon interstate commerce, and does not apply where that effect is indirect or incidental only, or merely collateral to the main object of the agreement.

The contract in question, it was held, came within these rules; it directly affected interstate commerce by destroying competition and maintaining rates above what competition might produce; and Congress had the power to say that no contract or combination should be legal which should restrain trade and commerce by shutting out the operation of the general law of competition. The court said:

"The prohibition of such contracts may in the judgment of Congress be one of the reasonable necessities for the proper regulation of commerce; and Congress is the judge of such necessity and propriety, unless in case of a possible gross perversion of the principle the courts might be applied to for relief."

These views had the approval of the same members of the court who concurred in the *Trans-Missouri* case; while the minority still dissented.

In *Hopkins vs. United States*, decided October 24, 1898, the claim was that the Kansas City Live Stock Exchange was an illegal combination within the terms of the Anti-Trust Act. The Exchange was an association of persons engaged in selling on commission live stock consigned from other States, and remitting the proceeds to the owners. By

the practice of the Exchange, the members were somewhat restricted in their dealings with non-members; and the by-laws regulated the rates of commissions and the number and compensation of solicitors and other employees of the members, and prohibited telegraphing prepaid reports of the markets.

The court said that the Anti-Trust Act

"has reference only to that trade or commerce which exists or may exist among the several States or with foreign nations, and has no application whatever to any other trade or commerce; the contract condemned by the statute is one whose direct and immediate effect is a restraint upon that kind of commerce which is interstate; to treat as condemned by the Act all agreements under which, as a result, the cost of conducting an interstate commercial business may be increased would enlarge the application of the Act far beyond the fair meaning of the language used; there must be some direct and immediate effect upon interstate commerce in order to come within the Act."

Accordingly, the rule was laid down that facilities furnished, or services rendered, in connection with the transaction of interstate commerce are not a part of that commerce, and agreements or combinations to fix or maintain the charges for such facilities or services are not within the Anti-Trust Act. Although they may enhance the cost of transacting it, they do not relate directly to charges for its transportation, nor to any other form of interstate commerce, and are not prohibited by the statute. It was, therefore, held that in this case the business done by the members of the Exchange was merely the sale and purchase as commission merchants of live stock at Kansas City, and that its character was not affected by the fact that the larger proportion of the purchases and sales were of live stock sent into the State from other States and Territories. Where the stock came from, or where it might ultimately go after a sale or purchase, was unimportant; the services of those persons employed at the place where the cattle were sold were not a portion of interstate commerce, but were merely a local aid or facility provided for the cattle-owner; and an agreement among those who rendered the services relating to their terms was not a contract in restraint of interstate trade or commerce. The court was unanimous in reaching these results.

The construction which the Act has thus received establishes that its scope is very narrow and that few except those engaged directly in the business of interstate transportation are affected by its provisions. The statute applies to nothing save interstate commerce, which begins when the subjects thereof begin to move to their place of destination, and ends when they are sold. Local facilities or individual services incident to this operation are no part of interstate commerce, and are not covered

by the Act. It does not prevent combinations among producers even although the product is intended wholly for shipment to other States; nor does it prevent combinations among those handling the product at the place of consignment, even although it has all come from out of the State and is destined for shipment to still other States. The question affected by the Act, therefore, so far as merchandise is concerned, relates merely to the right to transport it from one State to another and to dispose of it in the latter.

What contracts or combinations restraining this right are prohibited by the Act? In the *Trans-Missouri* case, it was vigorously urged that the Act should be construed not literally, but reasonably, and that this would lead to construing it as prohibiting merely contracts coming within modern juristic definitions of the term "in restraint of trade," as embracing the feature of injury to the public welfare. The court rejected this view, and held that the Act must be construed according to its letter, and as covering all contracts in restraint of interstate or foreign commerce without exception or limitation.

Yet it seems that in the *Joint Traffic* case and the *Live Stock Exchange* case this rule has been qualified. In those cases, in answer to suggestions regarding the results of *literal* construction of the Act, the court said that the Act must receive a "*reasonable* construction," and that various contracts or combinations affecting trade are not within the statute because they are not within "any legal definition" of the term "in restraint of trade." It said, too, that while Congress had power to make regulations prohibiting restraint of interstate or foreign commerce, "in case of a possible gross perversion of the principle the courts might be applied to for relief." Still further, the court held, in the *Joint Traffic* and the *Live Stock Exchange* cases, that the statute does not apply to all contracts or combinations in restraint of interstate commerce "without exception or limitation," but merely to those which have that effect directly; that where that effect is indirect, the contracts or combinations are not within the statute. Many instances were stated of contracts or combinations of constant occurrence necessarily affecting the volume of interstate commerce or the prices of merchandise forming the subject-matter thereof; but it was said that these were not within the statute, because their effect upon interstate commerce was indirect.

In brief, then, the result of these recent cases is that, so far as merchandise is concerned, the statute affects nothing except the right to transport it from one State to another, and its sale in the latter State, and

that it protects that right only against contracts or combinations which, upon a reasonable interpretation of the Act, are in direct restraint thereof. Producers may combine to limit production or control prices; those furnishing services or facilities in the transaction of interstate commerce as above described may combine to fix the price or extent of those facilities or services; the consignees may combine to control the price of their services or the number of persons engaged in the business; but none of these combinations will be within the statute.

These results have naturally followed from the rule that the National Government has no powers save those expressed in the Constitution; for the express power granted to Congress extends to the regulation only of interstate or foreign commerce. But they make it clear that the statute can have little application save to those who are engaged in the business of carriers; inasmuch as interstate commerce consists of but little save that business. Aside from that, the Act, as now construed, like most efforts to regulate the laws of trade by statute, does not seem likely to have serious general effect. It is evident, too, how baseless is the clamor kept up in regard to the non-enforcement of the Anti-Trust Act; for the objects against which that clamor is principally directed do not come within the prohibition of the Anti-Trust Act nor within the powers of legislation conferred upon Congress by the Constitution.

DAVID WILLCOX.

GERMANY AND GREAT BRITAIN.—II.

It would seem that Englishmen, after their recent experiences, would not find it difficult to abandon forever all speculations as to the possibility of instigating a Continental war. Indeed it would appear as if they should carefully avoid all appearances of such a design. Possibly many Englishmen may have been thoroughly in earnest in their desire to protect the Armenians and other Christian subjects of the Sultan against Turkish atrocities; but they should realize that we are not disposed to stand under fire because of English sympathy, and that we would rather have the Christians and Mohammedans of a Turkish island decapitate one another than see millions of Germans, Austrians, and Russians embroiled in war, and the whole continent of Europe deluged with blood.

Above all it is necessary for Great Britain to realize that her chances of inducing Central Europe to wage war for her against Russia are very slim. Although, in my opinion, Germany's Oriental interests are very considerable, they are not sufficiently pressing to warrant her acting as vanguard against Russian domination in the eastern hemisphere, in order that she may draw the chestnuts out of the fire for England. Germany can afford to be the last to fall into rank. If Englishmen believe that, by abandoning Constantinople to Russia, they will involve us in a life-and-death struggle with that Power, while they stand aside as neutrals, they are greatly mistaken. It is indeed a question of existence for Central Europe to prevent Russia from gaining a permanent footing in the Balkan States, on the Bosphorus, in the Dardanelles, in Asia Minor, and in Mesopotamia; yet the question of defence does not lie immediately with the Powers of the Triple Alliance. Even if England should abandon Constantinople and the Straits to the Russians, Central Europe need not immediately take up the sword.

As far as the Germans and Austrians are concerned, the principal gateways to and from the Orient are Salonica and the Suez Canal rather than Constantinople and the Dardanelles; and they can press forward to Salonica whenever Russia forcibly occupies Mt. Athos. Germany can wait until the crisis shall arrive when England is no longer able

to push other nations to the front, *i.e.*, in the *Ægean* Sea or before Alexandria. The immediate duty of German statesmanship is to hold back Austria from a premature and unnecessary attack on the Empire of the Czar.

The Germans should also have learned something in the course of the recent Oriental tangles. By our antipathy toward England we only play into the hands of Russia, which country, amid the unprofitable strife between Germany and England, laughs in her sleeve and reaps the harvest. In Athens, as formerly in Sofia, the people are in favor of the Czar. The situation in the Orient is to-day more strained, and riper for Russian *coups de main* against Turkey, than ever before. Such a condition is a menace to the peace of Europe and, consequently, to that of Germany.

Thus we see that both England and Germany have cause to ponder well the lessons they have just learned, and, instead of fostering antipathy, to devote themselves to the pursuit of high and mutual political aims. I am of the opinion that, to achieve this purpose, the same sacrifice will be necessary for both parties. Each must cast aside a great prejudice.

Englishmen believe that their colossal fleet alone will enable them to hold the Russians in check and to intimidate other nations at the same time. On the other hand, a large portion of the German people is of the opinion that the Oriental questions do not immediately affect Germany, and that, in the inevitable struggle for life and death between Russia and England, we may rest on our guns.

Each of these views, although widely accepted, is erroneous. Both nations are equally concerned in guarding against the universal dominion of Russia in the Old World; and both should pursue such a policy as would avoid a general clash of arms. This will be possible if England and the Powers of Central Europe stand prepared to assert their tremendous superiority by throwing into the balance the greatest army and the greatest navy in the world, to the end that the peace of the world may be preserved.

It is still the boast of Englishmen that their means will permit them to maintain the British fleet at such a high standard as will enable them permanently to assert their superiority over the rest of the world. But perhaps—and we Germans may say this quite unconcernedly—England is mistaken in her reckoning. The time may come when the combined fleets of France, Russia, the United States, Japan, and the Powers of the Triple Alliance may become so powerful as to take the

wind out of the British sails and to make it impossible for England to find sufficient men for her navy.

But we Germans have not the slightest reason to begrudge England a fleet which shall permanently be a match for the rest of the world. Indeed, it is just as much to our interest to have England maintain a formidable navy against France and Russia as it is to have this navy fairly counterbalanced by the fleets of Russia and France. We know that we can never wage a war upon British soil. We are therefore content, either alone or in union with other states,—whose fleets we can accommodate in the harbor of Kiel, in the North Sea, and in the Baltic Canal,—to guard the harbors and coast-line of the North and Baltic seas against a possible blockade, so that our own or other neutral merchant vessels may be protected.

We do not even fear an English war of extermination against Germany, such as was advocated a short time ago by the "Saturday Review"; for, by merely maintaining an armed neutrality on the Baltic, the Vistula, and the Danube in favor of Russia, Germany could arrange that England be menaced in Asia by a land attack from the entire military force of Russia. Consequently, there is nothing in Mr. Goschen's enlargement of the navy which can intimidate us or induce us to declare war against Russia.

Englishmen themselves should consider that Russia is well-nigh unassailable, so far as England is concerned. The transoceanic commerce of Russia will for a long time to come remain inconsiderable. England cannot therefore damage the prosperity of the Russian people. The most gigantic English fleet can scarcely blockade or destroy a few Russian harbors. At all events such a fleet could not pass over the Hindu Kush to Kandahar, or even reach the Upper Indus; nor could it sail up the Pruth, the Vistula, and the Volga, and fight land battles with naval ordnance. The great Land-Power of those Continental states whose future is also menaced by the supremacy of Russia must stand by the side of England to guard against usurpations on the part of Russia. Moreover, the fleets of the Triple Alliance would be a very valuable aid to England in that naval battle with Russia which may possibly have to be fought before Alexandria in order that the neutrality of the Suez Canal may be maintained.

On the other hand, it is clear that Germany is greatly interested in preventing Eastern Asia and the whole of Turkey from becoming the exclusive markets of France and Russia, and in forestalling all attempts to make Turkey an exclusive domain for the extension of the Slav

element to the south and west. Germany, together with Austria and Italy, must also ensure the freedom of the Suez Canal and keep Asia open for her surplus goods and population. Germany must not permit the domineering influence of Russia to penetrate to Prague, Agram, and Trieste. The Triple Alliance should be extremely solicitous to have the solution of the Oriental Question, upon the entire line from Constantinople to Peking, so conducted that the peace of the world may be maintained. This, however, is possible only so long as the Powers of the Triple Alliance have England's fleets upon their side.

Thus we see that while, in the event of Russian usurpations, Germany need not be the first to draw the sword, she is nevertheless immediately interested in the Orient; and if she has recently manifested her cognizance of this truth by the extremely opportune seizure of Kiao Chou, how much greater the necessity of preventing Turkey, the Suez Canal, and Egypt from becoming a prey to France and Russia. The fact is therefore indisputable,—assuming, of course, that England is willing to pledge herself to share advantages and sacrifices alike,—that the Oriental interests of both nations are identical.

In my opinion, a positive Anglo-German Oriental policy may be formulated as follows: The equal right of all nations to conduct intercourse with all Asiatic countries now under European guardianship excepting such only as have already become colonies of individual states, or, to use the words of Lord Salisbury, "the policy of open doors." It only remains for all parties concerned to accept one and the same definition of the term. England would have to advocate such a policy not only in Western Asia, but in Eastern Asia as well. The privilege of "open doors" would have to be extended to all nations, including Russia, France, and North America.

Under the protection of the above policy, all nations would have to be just as independent of English as of Russian favor. They would have to be in a position to combine in order to maintain the inviolacy of the "open doors" of commerce and to ensure the freedom of the great straits of the world, should Russia endeavor to effect a *coup de main*; and, *vice versa*, they would have to combine with Russia should England endeavor to institute a similar policy. All the great sea-passages of the world, not only the Suez Canal, but also the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, according to the international proceedings of the Suez Convention, would have to remain neutral avenues, affording free passage to all naval and merchant fleets in times of peace as well as of war. Safe harbors, serving as *points d'appui* of trade and as stations for fleets, not

only in the Eastern Mediterranean, but in Eastern Asia as well, should be conceded to every nation,—harbors in the Mediterranean to Russia, and also to Germany, should the latter demand them.

The policy of annexation in particular cases, as in Tunis, Madagascar, and Ton-King, would have to be discontinued in China, Korea, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor; while the principles of the Congo Act should be extended to these territories. All the Powers should be placed in a position to fell to the ground the first who violates the policy of international parity, whether it be upon the Bosphorus, the Suez Canal, or in China. "Knock down the first who breaks the peace of the Eastern world!" Such is the interpretation which should now be given to the words spoken by the Earl of Aberdeen in 1854.

Will the English abandon themselves unreservedly to such an Oriental policy? That is the question. Should they do so, Russia and France will be unable further to carry on their colonial policy of "closed doors." They will everywhere find open markets for their own goods; but they will be unable to provoke a universal war in favor of Russian political supremacy. Should England eventually adopt a policy such as that outlined above, I hope that the German people and the German Government will not long remain averse to it. Even if Germany, thanks to its army and its army management, is still in a position—so long as it is disposed "to fear God and no one else in the world"—unaided to "front" against Russia and France at the same time, and this with excellent prospects of success, I nevertheless deem it desirable to avoid throwing the dice of war and to cultivate the works of peace.

Can a mutual Oriental policy be pursued, however, without a parallel policy in the Occident? My problem would be only half solved, were I unable to find a positive answer to this question. I have already stated that, as regards the trade in the Occident, *i.e.*, the trade with the civilized parts of the Old World and the New, Great Britain has hitherto not given the slightest cause for complaint. England has steadily maintained perfect freedom of intercourse, and has given foreign flags equal access with her own merchant vessels to all her markets. But all this may change. No one could blame England for actually closing her colossal markets in favor of her own industries and those of her colonies. In this respect, the other states have for years been ahead of her. There is already a considerable element in England to-day in favor of reserving the markets of Great Britain exclusively, or, at least preferably, for her own people. Canada not long ago took the first step. In Germany also, not only agrarian, but also commercial, Protectionism has pros-

pects of increasing influence. Possibly the further increase of German industrial duties may finally induce England to take the initial steps toward a gradual dissolution of the "Eleven Article Tariff."

The next developments of the commercial policy in the Occident must, therefore, be subjected to the closest scrutiny. They may exert a far more decisive influence than even the Oriental policy upon the relations between Germany and England. Either England will abandon her present passive policy of Free Trade, and proceed in the direction of Protectionism,—thereby increasing the antagonism on the Continent,—or she will actively pursue, in conjunction with Central Europe, a policy of free intercourse founded upon Reciprocity. In the latter case a joint procedure in the Orient would be greatly facilitated and strengthened. The intercourse between civilized countries,—more particularly between contiguous countries of the Old World, whose culture is of an older date,—is not less important than that with the Colonies and the younger economic factors in foreign parts. The greater the success attending the legitimate efforts of the younger countries of the world toward the development of their industries and trade, the greater the relative importance of the commercial relations between the countries of the Old World.

Now, there are no two groups of states in the Occident whose common interests are more closely identified with a mutual commercial policy than England, on the one hand, and, on the other, the following politically and economically closely related states; viz., Germany, Austria, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, Switzerland, and perhaps also the Balkan States and Roumania. A mutual, or at least a homogeneous, policy on the part of this populous group of states, extending, as it does, obliquely through Europe, is an immediate and pressing necessity, and will be a guarantee that in its relation to the rest of the world, Central Europe, in the more remote future, will not sink to the level in which we find Spain and Portugal to-day. If it be possible, in a political and commercial sense, to draw a belt around England and the Central European group from London and Glasgow to Constantinople and Salonica, such a belt should be drawn.

It follows that the principal thing is to find ways and means by which in the Occident also the doors of intercourse may be kept open, or rather may be opened more widely. I believe this is possible upon two conditions. A policy of "open doors" cannot be instituted between two or more civilized countries in the same way in which it would be arranged between the civilized countries of Europe, on the one hand, and the barbaric or semi-civilized countries of the Orient, on the other.

Consequently, the first condition would be that, despite mutual and homogeneous commercial interests, every self-governing state should remain undisturbed in its sovereignty and independence.

Homogeneity can be established only in the form of temporary commercial and tariff treaties; indeed, it would be more largely a matter of identical principles of independent action than of binding rules. The necessity for every important nation to possess harbors and stations on the coasts of other states—as, for instance, in Oriental regions—would not require discussion in its application to the Occident; and so we perceive that a permanent peaceable understanding might be facilitated by the extension of an existing principle.

A second and indispensable condition of a peaceable commercial policy is, that not only the political, but also the economic, individuality of every civilized nation, as distinct from every other, would have to be respected and recognized; and this, according to the degree of development which might be expected of each and every country at a given epoch.

Neither extreme Protectionism nor Free Trade in the sense of Cobdenism would be consonant with such an idea. One and the same tariff, that of the Eleven Articles, such as has long been in existence in England, can at no period become the universal tariff of the whole world; for it is impossible to predict that the same degree of development for each and every article of production will ever be attained and maintained by each and every country at the same time. A universal tariff, the dream of the orthodox Free-Trade party, will ever remain a Utopia, irreconcilable with the independent economic and industrial development of nations.

There is, however, a medium between absolute Free Trade and extreme Protectionism. It is what a few Englishmen call "Fair Trade." Each nation concedes to the other as much free intercourse as possible, and, in return, receives reasonable concessions regarding articles whose importation cannot prove detrimental, but stimulating. The concession of free intercourse is mutual regarding all goods which either cannot be, or are not at the time, produced by the country granting the concession. In this way the greatest reciprocal stimulus may be obtained; and, provided home labor is restricted within the necessary bounds, international competition may be engendered, which may prove fruitful everywhere and damaging nowhere. Fair Trade in this sense may really be established by the unanimous consent of the nations.

The great advantages of a homogeneous commercial policy based upon

this principle are easy to perceive. In the first place, it would be advantageous to those civilized nations who voluntarily concede broader intercourse to one another, and who are interested in keeping the doors open to the extent of admitting stimulating competition. There is, however, another consideration scarcely less important. A harmonious policy of Fair Trade, founded upon treaties not seriously interfering with the autonomy of the separate states constituting the parties to the contract, would create a powerful and effectual weapon against the brutal Prohibition of any third state or group of states. A united and systematic policy of countervailing duties is far more effectual than an isolated and unmethodic defensive attitude.

Again, a mutual policy of Fair Trade would surely result in moderating the extreme policies of Tariff parties everywhere. Agrarianism would be deeply interested in holding extreme Protectionist industrialism in check, because the latter would hamper the disposal of agricultural products to foreign countries. The converse also is true. A policy of moderation could not but obtain recognition and prove of particular advantage to all nations,—the older nations as against the younger, and *vice versa*.

It is scarcely necessary to expatiate upon the meaning of such a policy at a time like the present, when a universal tariff war between all nations is constantly becoming more threatening. Had Great Britain at once retorted to the latest tariffs of Germany, Russia, and the United States by effectual countervailing duties; had she annulled her Eleven Article Tariff, and instituted differential duties,—in the Colonies in favor of the Mother-Country, and in the Mother-Country and Colonies in favor of all such Central European States as were willing to make reciprocal and favorable concessions to Great Britain,—the doors between the civilized countries of the world would have remained more widely open than they now are or presumably will be in the near future.

Nor can a mutual or homogeneous policy in the Occident on the part of Great Britain and Germany be rightfully interpreted as an infringement of the individual development of any third group of states, or even as a menace to Russia and North America. Countervailing duties, when instituted in the true spirit of Fair Trade, would never be carried so far as wilfully to restrict any nation's privilege of free intercourse, when the restriction would prove seriously detrimental to such nation's industrial and economic welfare. It would not happen, for instance, that England and Central Europe would dictate to Russia or the United States conditions of Free Trade concerning industrial products

any restriction upon which would seriously damage the best interests of the countries themselves. On the other hand, it is unlikely that Russians, Americans, Australians, Canadians, or Africans at the Cape will ever prescribe for European countries a ruinous tariff concerning agricultural products and live stock. Brutality on either side would be bridled.

Nor would a parallel policy of Fair Trade on the part of Great Britain and Central Europe ever become a menace to any third group of states; for, the sole purpose of such a commercial union would be to induce other states to unite also, and then to deal with them upon a basis of reciprocity,—opening the doors and keeping them open so far as circumstances permitted.

It is quite natural, however, that the older states lying closely together should take the initiative; that Central Europe should be the first to assemble under the flag of a just and neutral Fair Trade; that those European nations, in short, who have reached the same degree of economic development, and whose institutions in this regard rest upon similar principles, should be the first to unite. It is for them to consider, above all, how they may maintain a respectable and commanding position by the side of the empires of the future, so mighty in their plan,—the empires of the Slavs, North Americans, Australians, South Africans, and yellow races.

Like Germany and the other Central European countries, England would lose her position in the foreground of the world's commerce so soon as her free or Crown Colonies should seek independently to develop their trade and industries by inaugurating a policy of Protection. In a commercial sense, therefore, England must seek her future by the side of Germany; but not for the purpose of a joint policy of hostility against the United States and Russia. States already comparatively small, or in imminent danger of becoming so, should naturally be the first to stand together; so that, by their unity, they also might constitute a body sufficiently large to enable them to enter into the far broader relations of the future. A combination on the part of England and Germany would place those countries in a position to organize their commercial policy upon lines suggested in North America and Russia at the very outset by the much greater extent of territory of those countries. The principal thing at present is to see to it that in the near future Western and Central Europe, commercially speaking, shall not sink to a mere Lilliputian existence. Even if Great Britain and Germany should seasonably recognize their identity of interests in the Orient as well as in the Occident,

the chances are that, within a few generations, Central Europe, instead of maintaining a position in the first rank, will be eclipsed by rival influences.

Have I in the foregoing abandoned myself to an unpractical "music of the future"? I do not think so, for the following reason: Both nations are, as it were, momentarily at the cross-roads. They can institute Fair Trade; but the danger lies near that they will not do so. What, in fact, is the general sentiment prevailing in the two countries respecting a commercial policy?

In Germany, the contrast between Agrarianism and Industrialism, between commercial capital and that of production, is more strongly accentuated than it has been at any other time since the formation of the German Customs Union sixty years ago. Whoever, like the author, has personal recollections of the fanaticism for Free Trade, which thirty years ago agitated all Prussia and notably the great farmers of the land, must be completely at sea concerning the present aspect of economics in Germany. Since 1879 the duties on industrial products have become higher than ever before; and it seems that the unappeasable hunger for greater Protection is still increasing. In addition to this, the upper as well as the middle classes among the agricultural population are to-day waging a violent agitation in favor of protective and prohibitory agrarian duties, as well as for prohibitory duties on imports of cattle and agricultural products. There are many to-day who believe that the distress among the farmers, who are now so heavily burdened with debts, cannot be permanently alleviated by protective duties and enactments against pestilence, but only by a thorough reform of our modern latitudinary credit system. Yet so great is the distress at present prevailing that even these persons can understand the violence of the Agrarian agitation.

For the moment, at least, the situation in Germany is such that Industrialism and Agrarianism may at any time give rise to a tariff war of unparalleled magnitude. After all, the renewal of Germany's commercial treaties with foreign states is not due until 1903. The more progress a rational policy of "open doors" shall make until then, both upon the other side of the Canal and upon the other side of the Atlantic, the greater the hinderances which extreme Protectionism will encounter in Germany. Thus we see that for Germany also a policy of Fair Trade is of actual and pressing importance.

The same is true of Great Britain. It is a well-known fact that there is a powerful party in England to-day identified with the old Brit-

ish sentiment,—a party whose enmity Germany has already encountered in her colonial and Oriental policy. The aim of this party is to form Great Britain into a “Greater Britain.” England is to arrange an Inter-British Customs Union with her Colonies, providing for preferential duties in favor of the industrial products of the Mother-Country as well as for the agricultural products of the Colonies. Who could find fault with England, were she to pursue such a commercial policy? Indeed it is astonishing that British patience was not exhausted ten years ago, and that the first steps toward a universal British Customs Union have not already been taken. England, with her Colonies, represents a territory of production and consumption to which even the Russians and the Americans at their present stage of development can furnish no parallel. The raising or lowering of the tariff-screws in a “Greater Britain” would in itself constitute the strongest retaliatory weapon against all other nations. Even the foreigner can understand how seductive the idea of a “Greater Britain” must be to every Englishman. So we see that the question at issue is whether Fair Trade is to be instituted in union with Central Europe or in the form of an exclusive Inter-British Customs Union in every part of the world. This alternative in its bearing on England also is of the greatest practical importance in the future.

I am of the opinion that a joint Fair-Trade policy on the part of Germany and Great Britain would also be greatly advantageous to England, if not in the immediate, at least in the more distant, future. “Greater Britain,” when we view it more closely, is not without its serious drawbacks. The Australians, Canadians, Cape Colonists, and the East Indian Colonists whose factories were, and are still being, organized with European capital,—all these are debarred by their own finances from according the Mother-Country full Free Trade in industrial commodities.

On the other hand, the Mother-Country will be unable to raise the price of bread and raw materials by introducing preferential duties in favor of the Colonies.

Furthermore, the time will come when all the Colonial possessions of Great Britain will endeavor, by means of Protection,—possibly even of Prohibition,—to develop their industries independently, and will create an active merchant marine. They will follow the same commercial policy that was pursued by the Americans, the Russians, and by the English themselves at a similar stage of their economic development. Indeed, this time is not far distant. I will not deny, however, that Germany’s interests in what I have designated as Fair Trade are even

greater than those of England. An exclusive commercial policy on the part of the entire British Empire would possibly give the English a considerable advantage for half a century; but Germany's export trade would be greatly injured in consequence. True, we should not be entirely defenceless against England; for we might retaliate to a policy of exclusiveness on the part of a "Greater Britain" by establishing favorable conditions facilitating reciprocal exchange between American and Russian agricultural products, on the one hand, and our own industrial products, on the other. But the advantages which would be derived from a parallel commercial policy on the part of Great Britain and Germany could not be so easily compensated: we should lose and at once.

As regards economic questions, the author's most ardent wish is that England and Germany may arrive at an understanding concerning the adoption of a policy of "open doors" for all nations; and the lasting benefits to be derived from such a policy should recommend it to England.

Will England and Germany realize the solidarity of their interests and act accordingly? What sensible member of either nation would desire differently? But it is impossible at present to gaze with unconcern into the future. In the face of the violent political storm of conflicting tariff interests, the calm observer is reminded of the awesome words spoken by one of our greatest philosophers of history—Herder: "The majority of people are hard, iron animals, whose danger must be great indeed before they leave their accustomed paths." Will the iron animals of to-day soon become soft? It frequently happens that at first many stupid paths must be traversed before we enter upon the right road, although the latter may have been quite near at the beginning.

In conclusion, I would express my general view only in the form of a hypothetical opinion. Adapting the words of Von Bülow, I should say: Unless Germany and Great Britain during the approaching century realize the necessity of standing side by side in the sunshine, in union with all civilized nations, they will, in the twenty-first century, find themselves placed in the shadow. ALBERT VON SCHÄFFLE.

THE PROTEST OF THE PILLAGER INDIANS.

Is our attempt to civilize the Indian a failure? This is the question heard on every side since the recent so-called outbreak of the Bear Island Pillagers, a band of Chippewa Indians living on and near the borders of Leech Lake in Minnesota.

Is our Caucasian civilization a failure? By the same token, yes. A few days before the Pillager trouble, a mob of white men hanged a Negro in a thickly settled district of Maryland. A few days after the Pillager trouble a murderous riot occurred in a mining town of Illinois, because a gang of white laborers were unwilling either to work at certain wages or to let Negroes take their places and their pay. A few days later still a Negro in Mississippi resisted arrest, and a party of his friends fired into a white sheriff's posse with fatal effect. The citizens of the neighborhood then armed themselves and set out upon a Negro hunt, in the course of which they killed several blacks.

Let us try to be just to the Indian. Is it a sign of the failure of any scheme of civilization that under it race antagonisms survive, individuals usurp the functions of organized justice, and masses of ignorant men, despairing of any other means of resenting a supposed trespass on their rights, resort to bloodshed? In the light of the illustrations just cited, shall we paraphrase the most familiar precepts of our Indian philosophy and say that "there is no good Marylander except a dead Marylander," or that "the only way to settle the Labor Question is to exterminate the laborer"?

The purpose of suggesting this parallel is not to approve of violence as a means of redressing grievances. Both the white rioters and the Indian insurgents did wrong. But some differences between their methods of procedure will be noted. If we had asked a member of the Maryland mob why he helped to hang the Negro, he would have answered that the Negro had committed a gross offence against social morals. When? Last night. If we had asked an Illinois striker why he took up arms against the imported "scabs," he would have answered that the "scabs" had come to rob him of his livelihood. When? To-day. In both instances we see the impelling cause immediately back of the

act of outlawry, and something like a proportional relation between the incentive and the act. But when we inquire what motive the Pillagers had for their violence, the only one in view is an attempt by a United States marshal and his deputies to serve a subpoena upon an Indian who was wanted as a witness in a liquor case. This looks like a trivial reason, indeed, for taking human life. Much as we may deplore the acts of the mobs in Maryland and Illinois, they are not incomprehensible. We can conceive of an access of righteous rage driving men of usually peaceful temper to take the law into their own hands. We can grasp the idea of rough men, accustomed to struggle for their share of daily bread, rebelling when they see others about to snatch it from their mouths. But the Pillager's readiness to shoot and kill merely for the purpose of avoiding service of a harmless writ passes the ordinary white man's understanding, except on the ground of the utter depravity of the Indian nature.

Now, in this contrast is summarized most of the difficulty which, as a nation, we have had in solving the Indian Problem. We have not begun by trying to measure the chief human factor in it. The Indian does not, like the white man, strike his blow in response to a momentary impulse of revenge. The sense of wrong which moves him to it is cumulative. He nurses his first grievance; a second is presently added to this, and both rankle in his soul; a third serves to magnify its predecessors; and so the process of accretion goes on, like the gradual increase of the weight of an avalanche, till by and by comes a cause of complaint, trifling perhaps in itself, but heavy enough, when added to the mass already gathered, to start the whole upon its mission of destruction.

In the case of the Pillagers, the attempt of a marshal and his posse to serve a subpoena was only the last of a series of irritating incidents which, but for the forbearance of the Indians, would have brought about an armed collision long ago. The Minnesota Chippewas originally owned a large area of territory; holding it by what is currently known as "Indian title"—that is, immemorial possession, and continued and undisputed occupancy. This title our Government voluntarily recognized by negotiating for cessions first of one tract and then of another; the Indians never manifesting any unfriendly spirit as the boundaries of their territory were gradually pared away.

A memorable instance, and one thoroughly typical of the white man's general treatment of the Indian, occurred in 1847, when the Government bought of the Pillagers a tract containing some 700,000 acres for the sum of \$15,000, or at the rate of about 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ cents an acre. The Pil-

lagers were loath to let this land go, but ceded it upon the promise of the Government commissioners that it should be given to the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin, who were to be removed thither and to make it their home. The Chippewas regarded this as the most important feature of the bargain: for the Menominees were their friends of long standing; the ceded tract lay between the home of the Chippewas and that of the warlike Sioux, their hereditary enemies; and the Menominees, being friends of the Sioux as well as of the Chippewas, would by their presence there make a barrier against the much-dreaded Sioux raids, thus insuring the peace of all parties. The disappointment of the Pillagers, when the Government failed to carry out this programme, may be imagined. In strict justice it should be said that the Government, although it ought to have been more prudent about making promises till it knew just where it stood, was not wholly to blame for the failure. The Menominees decided that they did not care to be removed to Minnesota. They preferred to be settled upon a part of their old home in Wisconsin, and made a clever bargain to this end, whereby they sold back to the Government for \$242,686 the land purchased for them from the Pillagers for only \$15,000. If the same rule had been followed then as in a similar transaction between whites, the next step would have been the restoration of the *status quo ante*. In other words, the Government, having defaulted on an essential part of its contract, would have offered the Pillagers the privilege of buying back the ceded land for the original price or, at any rate, for that sum with reasonable interest added. No such offer was made, however. The Pillagers, ignorant of business methods and having no one to advise them, helplessly folded their hands, and set this down as an act of bad faith on the part of the Government, for which there was no redress short of violence; and to that they were unwilling to resort. Here was their first serious grievance.

That the Indians have not set up a mere visionary claim in this case, we have proof in the testimony of Hon. Henry M. Rice, a prominent citizen of Minnesota, who was a member of the Commission of 1847 and also the leading member of the Commission of 1889. At the request of Flat Mouth, Chief of the Pillagers, who expressed his fear that the death of the parties to the agreement of 1847 might leave posterity without positive knowledge of what had taken place, Mr. Rice wrote out the following memorandum and gave it to the Indians:

"October 4, 1880.

In 1847, when the Pillager Indians, by treaty, sold to the United States the Leaf River country for a nominal consideration, it was understood that the country

ceded had been selected for the future residence of the Menominee Indians, who were friendly to the Chippewas, and the country would remain Indian territory. Not only this, but the Menominees would form a barrier between the Pillager and Sioux Indians, who had for centuries been at war. The old men thought by having the region thus occupied peace would follow; hence their consent to yield to the request of the Government.

They were sadly disappointed; for after the ratification of the treaty other provisions were made for the Menominees. The Leaf River country was thrown open to settlement, the game driven out, and the Pillagers exposed to all the evils that beset a frontier border. . . . The sale was positive. The Pillagers have no legal claim to the land, but morally have a claim upon the Government, which claim I hope may at some suitable time be acknowledged by giving to this poor band such aid as will improve its condition.

(Signed) HENRY M. RICE,
One of the Commissioners."

During a council held in 1889, of which the official stenographic record is on file in Washington, Mr. Rice reinforced this written exhibit by an oral statement to the effect that it had been understood between Flat Mouth and himself in 1847 "that that land was not to be used by the whites, but that it was for the use of the Menominees."

Forty years passed. The Government had meanwhile opened the ceded lands to white settlement; and a pioneer population had entered them. White prospectors, looking about for speculative enterprises, had cast covetous eyes upon the fine pine-forests in the remaining Chippewa country. The Red Lake reservation contained a particularly tempting growth. So Congress authorized a fresh negotiation for agreements authorizing the Government to dispose of a large part of the timber and agricultural lands of the Indians for their benefit. A commission visited the several Minnesota reservations and drew up agreements satisfactory to all parties; but when these were laid before Congress they were rejected because their provision for the Indians was too generous. Congress then took its own characteristic way of getting what it wanted: it passed an Act containing the features it wished to have incorporated in a general agreement with all the Minnesota Chippewas, and sent another commission to induce the Indians to give their consent to this. The Indians, having had their suspicions aroused by the first failure, held out for some time against making a second agreement. The commission, resolved not to go home with its errand unaccomplished, argued and urged and promised this and that, and in time succeeded in patching up an understanding; and, though the Bear Island Pillagers opposed the whole scheme almost to the point of violence, the Act of Congress received enough Indian signatures to constitute a technical ratification.

When it was too late to do any good, it was discovered that the language of the ratified statute, and the terms which a large body of the Indians declared were included in the oral negotiations, differed widely. In such a case the ignorant red man is at the mercy of the clever white. The Indian cannot read what is written in the formal instrument; and his interpreters tell him what they please. The Chippewas who took part in the councils of 1889 have always insisted, for instance, that the White Earth band were promised allotments of land of one hundred and sixty acres apiece, instead of the eighty acres which they actually received; that the Mille Lacs band were assured of the regular payment of certain annuities, which the Government afterward withheld to their great distress; and that to other bands were promised houses, sawmills, smithies, and the like, which have not been built for them to this day. It was the same way with the assurances which the commission gave the Indians as to the fabulous wealth they would derive from the sale of their pine-lands, without so much as a hint that the process of sale would be attended with any expense to the sellers. How those glittering prophecies have developed into fact will be seen at a later point in this article.

The Act of Congress to which, reluctantly and with many misgivings, the Indians at last consented, provided for the appointment of a commission of three members, to receive \$10 a day each, with an additional allowance of \$3 a day for expenses, and with necessary clerical assistance, who should allot the lands of the Minnesota Chippewas to the members of the tribe in severalty on the basis prescribed in the general law on this subject; the surplus lands to be ceded by the tribe to the United States Government. The bulk of these ceded lands would, of course, be covered with timber; and this the Government was to have appraised and sold for the benefit of the Indians. The method of appraisal was as ingenious a device for despoiling the Indians as any in the annals of our Century of Dishonor. There was not an enterprising lumberman in that Northwest country who would not gladly have sent his own estimators into the field, at no cost to the Government or to the Indians, and made offers based on actual inspection and calculation. Competition between the various bidders, and the means the Government possessed of sending its special agents to a tract here and there to verify the estimates—just as it examines imports every day in its custom-houses by samples seized haphazard—could have been relied on to keep the business somewhere within the bounds of ordinary honesty. At any rate, though the purchasers might have made goodly profits, the Indians would have been protected from such wholesale robbery as was

practised under the system adopted. This system consisted of the appointment by the Commissioner of the General Land Office of

“a sufficient number of competent and experienced examiners [who should] go upon said lands . . . and personally make a careful, complete, and thorough examination of the same by forty-acre lots, for the purpose of ascertaining on which lots or tracts there is growing or standing pine timber . . . the minutes of such examination . . . showing with particularity the amount and quality of all timber standing or growing on any lot or tract. . . .”

The pay of these examiners was set in the original Bill at \$4 a day; but Congress revealed its motive for adopting this method of appraisal by increasing the figure to \$6. From that moment it was obvious to everyone who had watched such matters in Washington that the examiners would be chosen on the patronage principle by Congressmen and local political managers, and that their “competence and experience” would be the last and least consideration entering into their selection.

As was expected, the three-headed commission set out with a leisurely deliberation calculated to prolong its employment and to continue its pay indefinitely; while the corps of examiners was made up, for the most part, of men whose only knowledge of timber-measurement had been gained in some other occupation—paper-hanging or bar-keeping, for example—before falling into this soft “Government snap.” All of them, however, were in political accord with the Federal Administration and with the party leaders through whose influence they had gained their appointments. The commission, which was continued for some six years at an immense and wasteful cost, and was then shorn down two-thirds because of the fear at Washington that the Indians might rebel against further imposition, was bad enough; but the corps of examiners, numbering thirty or more at a time, was worse. With exceptions so rare as to emphasize the rule, they were utterly worthless. The first lot were appointed under President Harrison’s Administration; and the scandal of their employment was so noisome that President Cleveland’s Administration, when it came into power, made short work of them. But those who stepped into their places were no better. Indeed, the Cleveland Administration before its retirement ordered an investigation of its own accord; and the revelations this brought forth were so shocking that the Administration made substantially a clean sweep of its own men. A third set are now at work; and, so far as can be ascertained, they show but little, if any, improvement upon their predecessors.

The investigation mentioned above, made by one of the most upright

and intelligent inspectors in the Indian service, showed that, of thirty-one examiners employed under one chief, eighteen had had no previous experience whatever in the line of work in which they were engaged; while the experience of the others amounted to almost nothing. They were divided into camping-parties of three; but their estimates were too often cooked up in the bar-rooms of country inns, or between deals in a game of cards, and were for all intents pure guesswork. To show the value of these guesses it may be noted that in one group of eighty-five tracts, on which 9,635,000 feet of pine lumber had been reported, a conservative estimate made later by real experts showed 17,271,000; and another group of sixty-one tracts, reported as containing 5,547,000 feet, showed 12,472,000. One tract reported as containing 11,000 feet actually measured up 295,000; another, reported at 65,000, measured 782,000; a third, reported as containing 15,000, measured 125,000; while a fourth, reported at 25,000, measured 75,000. On a tract reported to contain 45,000 feet of pine no pine at all was growing; on a second, reported as containing none, there were 450,000 feet; on a third, reported as bearing 11,000 feet of white pine, there was no white, but about 200,000 feet of Norway, pine. Of course the lumbermen who bought the pine were not fools. They had their "cruisers" out, and made their own surveys quietly; but they had to buy on the basis of the official appraisal. Consequently, tracts which the Government examiners had grossly underestimated found purchasers as soon as the figures were announced; while those which had been appraised at anything like a fair valuation were a drug in the market.

The heavy cost of the commission engaged in allotting lands in severalty to the Indians, with the expense of this farcical process of appraisal added, has reached a total estimated at \$350,000 at the present date; and it is still rising. All the money thus squandered must come finally not out of the treasury of the Government, but out of the tribal purse of the Chippewas; for every cash advance made by the Government on account of salaries and expenses must be reimbursed by the Indians out of the net returns from the sale of their lands and timber. At the pace at which things are going, the Indians will be lucky if they ever rescue a dollar from the proceeds of this gigantic fraud. Is it strange that the Pillagers, who have watched the growth of the outrage, and who are liable to be among its victims in spite of the fact that they refused to sign the agreement under which it is perpetrated, have a sore feeling toward the whites?

In passing from this second grievance to a third—the ill-treatment

of the Indians by the United States deputy marshals—a few words of preliminary explanation may be necessary for the benefit of readers who are not familiar with life and civic conditions on our frontier.

The fee system of compensation for United States marshals and their deputies in the thinly settled Western country has been a perennial source of scandals from the day when it was first put into operation. So gross have been some of the abuses under it that Congress was shamed into making a change about two years ago, so that now the marshals and their office deputies are paid stated salaries. But the field deputies—those who do the work at a distance from the headquarters of the marshal—remain under the fee system as before. These deputies receive certain fees for serving writs, making arrests, subpoenaing witnesses, bringing in prisoners, attending court, and the like. Besides their fees they receive mileage for journeys which they make in pursuit of their calling; and their expenses are paid on these journeys and while attending court. Mileage and expenses are also paid by the Government for the prisoners and the witnesses whom the deputies have in charge, both on their journeys and during the sessions of court, and for such guards as are needed for watching and handling parties brought in from the field. No one who inspects the huge bills which are sent to Washington for such services, and reflects that the Government is practically at the mercy of the thrifty accountants who render them, can wonder that appointments to the force of field deputies are eagerly sought by a rough and often unscrupulous class of frontiersmen. Here and there, doubtless, a man enters the service because it offers him a living, or because he finds in it the excitement which his restless nature craves, or because it will give him a certain importance in the rude community where he lives; but it is safe to say that the controlling motive in most cases is the hope of unlawful pelf. One fundamental theory of government to which men of the deputy-marshal class are educated from their cradles is, that the National Treasury is a rich institution, and fair plunder for anybody who can get a chance at it. If a prisoner lives in the back-country, two or three days' journey from headquarters, the deputy who owns a horse can run up a fine bill for mileage. At night, if the weather be fair, he can roll himself in his blanket and sleep peacefully in the lee of a fallen log or a bank of earth; and if it be foul he can seek the hospitality of a settler's cabin,—in either event charging the Government the legal maximum for lodgings. Though he find his prisoner in the most complacent mood, this need not prevent his giving one of the neighbors a job as an additional "guard" and taking a share of the

guard's fees and bogus expenses, on the same principle that an employment-agency charges a commission on the wages of the working-people for whom it finds places. When the prisoner reaches the city where court is held, there is liable to be a considerable delay before his case is called; so the deputy hunts up a bondsman and keeps the prisoner at a hotel, the proprietor of which is usually willing to "do the right thing" by the deputy in recognition of the patronage brought to the house. And so it goes.

But prisoners are a poor resource as compared with witnesses. A prisoner may take a fancy to make trouble for his custodian, particularly if his arrest be on a charge which the courts are disposed to view harshly. A backwoods witness, however, is almost always good-natured. He may feel disinclined to tell tales about a neighbor and friend, even to a court; but, on the other hand, he may be vain enough to believe that he can evade the questions of the lawyers and the judge, and not actually reveal any more than he wishes. In any event, the prospect of a visit to the city at no expense to himself presents a strong temptation to one who leads his lonely life. The chances are not only that he will be willing to go with the deputy, but that he can furnish the names of two or three acquaintances who know as much about the case as he does. Before the deputy has finished his task for that term of court he is liable to have subpoenaed a round dozen or more of witnesses, every one of whom helps to swell his income legitimately or by private pickings.

On the borders of Indian reservations the deputy marshal finds a particularly profitable field for his activities. This is not because Indians are especially given to crime; for such offences as they do commit—or, more strictly, those of which the law as a rule takes cognizance—belong rather to the class of misdemeanors than of crimes. An Indian, for instance, very rarely murders a white man; and when he murders another Indian the agent punishes him, and the courts ignore the affair. But the Indian commits, or is suspected of committing, thefts of various degrees. If he is hungry, he may help himself to a white settler's steer; or, if he needs a horse, he may take one from a white neighbor's corral. Above all, the Indian is open to temptation on his convivial side. Fire-water he can seldom pass by. The borders of a reservation, therefore, always swarm with whites and mongrels who are ready to pander to his thirst, in defiance of all the prohibitory laws that Congress can enact.

Here, then, is the deputy marshal's finest labor market. He can hunt down and arrest an illicit liquor-dealer and subpoena Indian wit-

nesses by the score. It makes no difference whether these witnesses know anything or nothing: in either event, they count as witnesses and help to swell his fee- and expense-accounts. The liquor-seller, moreover, makes so large a profit out of his business that he may be ready to submit to arrest now and then, just to oblige a former crony who has become a deputy marshal. The worst penalty he can suffer is a brief sojourn in jail, after which he goes back to his bar with a clean score and refreshed energies.

The Indian witness is usually far more profitable to his custodian than a white witness. The Indian knows nothing of business. His ideas of money and its relative values are rudimentary; so that, when the court pays over to him his \$1.50 a day for the full term of his attendance, he has usually mortgaged the bulk of the sum due him for good things furnished on trust. He has enjoyed the fare of a tenth-rate boarding-house, which is royal luxury compared with what he has at home, and for which the charges are proportionately high; he has visited the cheap shows; he has smoked shag tobacco to his heart's content; and he has had as many surreptitious drinks of whiskey as he could be trusted to sleep off in his bedroom. By collusion with the attorneys concerned, it has been possible to stave off the trial of the case till the latest possible day, or perhaps to throw it over till another term; so that the period of recreation for the Indian and profit for his keeper has been greatly prolonged. When, finally, the day arrives for the Indian's return home, he is put aboard the cars with a ticket in his hat and three or four silver dollars in his pocket; and what has become of the balance of the money which the law requires the Government to pay him he neither knows nor cares.

This is a pitiful picture; but it is one familiar to everybody who has lived in or near the Indian country. In one region one tribe figures in it; in another, another; but the chief elements are everywhere the same. The collusive arrest and subpoena trade has been worked in some parts of the West to the last limit of endurance. In Minnesota the practice of carrying Indians away from their reservations, as petty offenders or witnesses, reached such a pass a few years ago that the Secretary of the Interior, as guardian of the Indians, had to make a formal protest to the Attorney-General, as chief of the Department which employs the marshals, against it. Some three hundred Indians were gathered in the city of St. Paul on such pretexts during one term of court. The Chippewas, of course, have been the chief sufferers from the nefarious system; and the Pillagers, owing to the fact that their band contains so large a non-

progressive element, easily accessible through their ignorance to bad influences, have probably furnished an undue proportion of victims.

Ignorant as the non-progressive Pillagers may be of worldly matters familiar to us, their sense of ordinary justice and fair dealing is as keen as that of the most highly educated Caucasian; and, according to the stories current in the district where the recent fight occurred, they have had at least one real cause of resentment. It is said that one of their number, having been taken away as a witness, was left stranded after the court had discharged him, and was refused even the customary ticket to carry him home on the cars. The consequence was that, without food to eat by the way, he had to tramp a distance of one hundred and sixty miles back to his camp. When he found himself once more among his friends, sick and famished, he made a vow to the Great Spirit that never more would he permit a white man to lure him from his home. Another subpoena was made out for him a few weeks ago. The deputy sent to serve it had a hard time finding the Indian, who, when the paper was forced upon him, tore it to pieces before the officer's eyes and refused to stir one foot in the direction of the court. When he was arrested a little later, he called upon his friends for assistance; and they fell upon the officers and rescued him. The officers announced that when they came again it would be with an escort of troops. Warrants were sworn out for all the Indians engaged in the rescue, and a marshal's posse was sent to serve them. A few soldiers went along to overawe the Indians, but were unable to accomplish anything. A larger body of troops followed, and took up a position on a promontory opposite Bear Island, where most of the Indians subject to arrest were supposed to be. While preparations for dinner were in progress, it is said that one of the soldiers accidentally discharged his gun. A group of armed Indians—supposed to have numbered twenty-five or thirty at most—had concealed themselves in an adjacent thicket, and were watching operations. The shot from the soldier's gun they took for a signal that the troops were about to open fire; and they forestalled this purpose by pouring a volley into the invading force. For two days desultory hostilities appear to have continued, with a total loss of seven lives; then came the beginning of a series of peace parleys. And this is what was advertised throughout the country—in the press despatches with lurid head-lines, and in editorial leaders filled with misgivings of an epidemic of massacre and rapine all over the great Northwest—as the "Pillager Outbreak."

From this brief review of three episodes in Chippewa history during the last fifty years the reader will understand more clearly the propo-

sition on a former page that the justification of an act of violence by Indians must not be sought simply in its nearest exciting cause, but that the visible incentive will usually be found to be the last of a cumulative series. The Chippewas, as a tribe, have been from the first the staunch friends of the white men; and they deserve only kindness at our hands. The early history of white exploration and settlement in Northern Minnesota and Western Wisconsin teems with evidence of the goodwill of these people, more commonly known through the old chronicles as the Ojibways. When the Sioux went on the war-path in 1862, and the Government at Washington had to divide its attention between the conduct of a great war in the South and the peril of a general Indian uprising in the North, the Chippewa, resisting the allurements and defying the threats of the insurgent tribe, remained faithful to his pledges of friendship for the pale-face and of loyalty to the Great Father. And what have we done to show our appreciation of our red brother's good conduct? We have procured cessions of his land under promises never fulfilled; we have stripped him of his rich timber in order to provide jobs for a lot of irresponsible political heelers; we have heaped upon his tribal treasury a load of debt which bids fair to swamp it; and we have allowed our law officers to make merchandise of his ignorance and childishness under the guise of prosecuting the business of our courts.

These are the main features of our scheme of compensation. But the Indians cherish also the memory of some lesser, but equally characteristic, manifestations of our gratitude. For example, we have been for years in the habit of paying them an annuity of nearly \$10 a head. Suddenly, without warning, we cut this down to a little more than \$5. It is not the purpose of the present writer to defend the annuity system any more than the practice of dispensing free rations among the Indians; for everything which wears in their eyes the look of a gratuity tends to pauperize them and to undermine their natural independence of character. But, having once entered upon an annuity system with a tribe, we should aim to modify it by such gradations and with such explanations that the Indians will understand the reasons underlying the change, and not be left with a sense of injustice rankling in their hearts. In this particular instance the Government technically justifies the reduction by a clause of the latest treaty which provides for spending a part of the Indians' money on schools for their children; but pains ought to have been taken to make the matter perfectly plain to the people affected by it.

Again, under a provision of law which permits the sale of the Indians' "dead timber, standing or fallen," at prices far below those fixed

for live timber, and under a departmental definition of dead timber as any that has been damaged by fire so that the worms are likely to infest it, white lumbermen have been doing a brisk business with the Indians wholly apart from the fraudulent process of examination and appraisal already described in detail. From the day this privilege began to be operative, fires in Chippewa forests have been of suspiciously frequent occurrence. The Indians have ascertained that the fires were started in many instances by unscrupulous lumbermen who wished to buy a lot of standing timber cheap; and this development has not increased their confidence in the good faith of their white neighbors.

But the crowning touch was added to all the Chippewa's grievances by the discovery that his despoilers had reached into his own circle of kindred, and were actually buying his flesh and blood away from him. There is reason to believe that parties interested in procuring the agreement of 1889 secured the votes and influence of some of the cleverer "mixed-bloods" by bribery. It is positively known that when work began under that agreement, any Indian who was considered to possess too much knowledge of the appraising swindle would be silenced by placing his name on the pay-roll in some capacity. The same practice has prevailed in the case of the collusive whiskey prosecutions. Half-breeds have been appointed deputy marshals, or hired as guards, because they could exert a greater influence among their kinsmen than any white man could. It is this use of money for turning Indian against Indian which has driven some of the "pure-bloods" almost to desperation. In the newspaper reports of recent peace councils we read of the protests of Indian speakers against letting half-breeds cut the tribal timber and against sending half-breeds to make arrests on the reservations. Editorial comments on this phase of the matter show that an idea prevails in the East that the non-progressive members of the tribe are trying to rob the half-breed of his means of earning an honest livelihood, because they hate the white blood in his veins. Nothing is further from the truth. The mere fact that the "mixed-blood" has one or more white ancestors, does not figure in the case at all. What does trouble the red Indian is the fact that his lighter-skinned brother puts his allegiance upon the auction-block, and knocks it down to the highest bidder. When a white man comes upon the reservation, he bears in his face a warning to the Indians that they must weigh his pleasant words with caution and not accept his promises too readily. When the "mixed-blood" comes, speaking their own tongue, worshipping their own deity, entering with hereditary ease into their mode of life, they are taken off their

guard. They trust his Indian lips; awakening too late to the fact that those lips speak the words of a white heart. As long as the half-breed casts his lot among them as one of themselves, the Indians have no prejudice against his color; but all their indignation is aroused when the whites hire him to go among his own people and play the part of a cats-paw and a spy.

The purpose of this paper has been to show that the so-called "Pillager Outbreak" was not an outbreak in any fair sense of the term, but an attempt of a handful of Indians to resist, on their own soil, what seemed to them a gross aggression on the part of an armed force of whites; and that even in that diluted form the trouble was not traceable simply to the service of an unwelcome subpoena, as at first represented, but was the culmination of a half-century's history of Indian friendliness and white overreaching.

What has been said of our treatment of the Pillagers is equally applicable, with various local modifications, to our treatment of the Indians all over the West. The other day witnessed the strange spectacle of a committee of Indians from the Indian Territory making a journey of two thousand miles to Washington for the purpose of seeing the President and ascertaining from his own lips whether a certain Act of Congress was really a law. Why? They had suffered so much at the hands of lying white men who had visited the Territory, and told them one story and another which afterward proved groundless, that they had no faith left to waste upon the representations made to them about this particular Act. They must have the Great Father's own word for it, or they would refuse to believe what they had heard.

Could any commentary be more striking? If our attempt at civilizing the Indian is a failure, whose fault is it? The Indian's?

FRANCIS E. LEUPP.

SOCIOLOGICAL AND ETHNICAL SOURCES OF THE GREATNESS OF VENICE.

THE traveller on the Grand Canal of Venice cannot fail to be impressed by the gigantic palaces which line its shores. What a contrast between these marvellous structures, beautiful in proportion to their age, and the modern buildings by which they are surrounded! As I contemplate this scene a whole series of problems presents itself to my mind. Wherefore this contrast, this difference in taste, in freedom of outline, and in architectural impressiveness from age to age? We compare the features of the modern Venetians with those of their ancestors, but fail to discover differences sufficiently marked to explain the present degeneration; nor can this be explained upon historical grounds. It is true that the destruction of the Venetian harbor, the discovery of America, and new geographical conditions generally have been instrumental in diverting the course of trade and wealth from Venice. Activity and skill remain permanent factors, however; and where these exist nations discover new paths to enterprise. In illustration of this rule it is necessary only to point to England. Furthermore, we should bear in mind that, while the discovery of America and India proved detrimental to Venice, new opportunities were opened to her in the Far East as well as in Africa—opportunities of which she utterly failed to avail herself.

I.—ETHNICAL GRAFTING.

Probably the most important factor of a country's progress is ethnical grafting. The first, and perhaps the greatest, of human inventions, the alphabet, may be traced, it appears, to the Semitico-Egyptian graft. The Semitic shepherds, in their endeavor to transcribe Semitic names into the Egyptian, were compelled to resort to phonetization. They were obliged to select for their purpose certain hieroglyphics; leaving to these the power of sound only.¹ The Dorians, as a pure race, were not great. As soon, however, as they became blended with the Italianized Sicilians and the Pelasgi of Sicily and Magna Græcia, they wrought a

¹ Rougé's "Origines égypt. de l'Alphabet phœnicien" (1859).

revolution in Etruscan art. Indeed, many men of genius, such as Archimedes, the Pitagorici, etc., sprang from this ethnical graft.

Although the Japanese were originally inferior to the Chinese,—possessing neither the commercial and financial talent nor the extraordinary activity of the latter,—they have since shown themselves much more progressive than their neighbors; quickly adopting European clothes, tools, railroads, universities, and new forms of government. The Japanese of to-day possess a strong admixture of Malayan blood; while the Chinese, although superior to the Malays, are nearly pure.

The graft of the German race—very potent because then in its formative stage—produced the phenomenon of Polish culture. The development of Poland in the midst of her Slavonic neighbors, who were still uncultured, was rapid and most marvellous. The Sicilians reveal greater evolutionary tendencies than the Neapolitans, and this because of their strongly mixed blood. Noteworthy, also, is the fact that the spirit of progress is strongest in Palermo, where the mixture of Norman and Saracen was strongest. The isolation of Venice is by no means a proof that the ethnical graft was missing. Long before the Venetians sought refuge in their islands, a mixture of Roman, Greek, and Slavonic blood had taken place among them. In the “Chronicon Altinate” (vol. xiv), we find a reference to the Greek elements in the people of the Island of Malamocco, for some time one of the capitals of Venice. Furthermore, many dialect words of the Venetians bear the impress of the Hellenistic element: for example, *calcirei* (copper; brass); *zigo* (to cry); *aponon* (to hazard), etc. In the abundance of final diphthongs also, and in the numerous geographical terms, we find unmistakable traces of Greek influence. Indeed, the art of glass-working and that of mosaics were originally imported into Adria and Altino from Greece.

Stronger and deeper, however, are the traces of the Roman strain. These we find in the nomenclature of the political orders—*magister militum*, *i tribuni*, *i fasci*, *le porpore*, etc.; in the custom of decking doors with garlands during festivals; in numerous dialect words, such as *nessa* for *neptis*, *goto* from *guttus* (a vessel for oil), etc.; in the unswerving fidelity and loyalty of the Venetians to the Roman power (even in the days of Hannibal, when the great Italian conspiracy afforded them an opportunity for liberation, they remained steadfast allies of Rome); in the numerous vestiges of Etruscan and Euganean populations; and in the fact that Adria and Ravenna were ancient Etruscan harbors.

The legend, derived from Strabo, Herodotus, and Justinian (“No-

vella," 29), points to a Greek and Illyrian derivation of the Venetians; representing that the Greeks, coming from Paphlagonia, after having dwelt at Troy, wandered about Illyria and along the Adriatic until they came to Venice. This justifies the Greek as well as the Asiatic and Illyrian origins. That, in addition to the Græco-Roman mixture, the Illyrian influence was very strong, appears clearly from some anthropological characteristics of the Venetians, which indicate a remarkable resemblance to the Slavs. These are: the high stature (1.66 m. for Venice; the general average for the Kingdom being only 1.64 m.); the large proportion of persons of the blond type (14.2 per cent; the percentage for the whole of Italy being but 9.3); a higher cranial index (85 in Venice as compared with a general Italian average of 82; and this feature becomes particularly manifest in the Slavonic province of Udine); the talent for navigation, possessed in a high degree by the Liburnians; the historical incursions of the Liburnians and Illyrians into the lands bordering upon the Adriatic; words of Slavonic origin found in lexicons; and the names of many rivers and provinces.

The strongest graft, however, came to Venice from the Byzantine Greeks; and it is from these that the Venetians derived that artistic inspiration and commercial ability which made them the greatest people of the Middle Ages. By itself Greece, already in a state of decline, could not flourish, nor contribute much to progress. When grafted upon another nation, however, the Greek stock produced excellent fruit.

Of the Byzantine influence we have numerous proofs; viz., Grado was a sort of harbor of the Greek fleet, and was occupied by a Greek garrison; the garb of the doges resembled that of the exarchs; prayers for the doges were offered in the churches according to the Greek ritual, while the funereal rites for a doge were partly Greek and partly Longobardian. Again, though the exact conditions of the political dependence of Venice on Constantinople have not yet been fully ascertained, we know that Venice was sometimes compelled to lend her fleet to the Greeks, and that claims of at least a nominal subjection to the Greek power were continuous. When Pepin desired to subject the Venetians, he received from them the reply, "We might yield to Byzantium, but not to thee"; an evident proof of the sympathy and dependence which bound them to the Greeks. Even under Narses the Venetians submitted to a kind of nominal protectorate exercised over them by the Cæsar at Constantinople, whom they evidently recognized as their liege lord, and whose name they appended to their laws. The Venetians adopted, or at least accepted, for their doges and generals some titles purely Byzantine, such as *Ipatio*,

Protospadaro. The Greek party in Venice frequently rebelled against the doges who had Frankish or German proclivities. The early custom of blinding or incarcerating the doges was Greek in its origin. The treaty of Nicephorus with Charlemagne (A.D. 803) declared that Venice was outside the dominion of the Franks, and under the sway of Constantinople. In 1085 Alexis Comnenus, in recognition of the aid given by the Venetians and the victories gained by them in the wars against the Normans, granted his Venetian subjects special privileges, such as immunity from all harbor duties and the right of establishing shops in Constantinople. After the capture of Constantinople in 1204, the Venetians had their own quarter in that city; while a number of Greek islands and coast-lands were also given to them, in recognition of their services. In addition to these possessions they acquired Candia, which they purchased from the Duke of Montferrat. When Constantinople was reconquered, the Emperor Palæologus granted new concessions to the Venetian Colony,—among others, the right to elect a city magistrate;—and these privileges endured even during the wars between the Greeks and the Venetians. In 1225 the question was long discussed in the Grand Council, whether Venice should not be transplanted to Constantinople, so intimate were the relations between the Greeks and the Venetians. Up to the tenth century the patron saint of Venice, St. Theodore, was a Greek; and that the Venetians did not adopt the feudal government, with its barbaric code of justice by ordeal and single combat, was undoubtedly due to the influence of the Byzantine Greeks, who, although barbaric, were, when compared with the Franks and Longobardians, entitled to rank as a civilized nation. It is to their influence, also, that the artistic richness and delicacy born of the union of the Byzantine, Moorish, and Gothic styles, still visible in the splendid structure of St. Mark's, may be traced. The art of working in glass was introduced into Venice by the Greeks. The Greek officers of the garrison furnished contributions, in order that the pavement of the Church of St. Euphemia might be completed; and the Emperor Leo, after sending the body of St. Zacharias to Venice, despatched thither many architects to build monasteries and churches in honor of that saint. Furthermore, we owe to the Greeks the foundations of the Ducal Palace (A.D. 820) and part of the Basilica of St. Mark. The Venetians learned from the Greeks the art of working in gold, silk, and silver; and at the sacking of Constantinople they acquired much valuable booty, which again furnished them with new ideas and magnificent artistic models.

But there was also an Eastern Syrio-Saracenic graft, which, in the very earliest times, had found its way into Venice. The coloring of the palaces, the richness of ornamentation in gold and mosaics, the manufactures in ivory and tapestries, and the art of gilding leather,—all these came originally from the Orient. Romanin justly observes that the merchants were naturally driven to the East, because all the West was at war. At times there were laws against buying Asiatic slaves,—for example, during the reign of Candiano IV, who, for this purpose, convoked the people and the nobles. In 959 and 971, at the request of the Greeks,—an additional proof of Greek influence,—it was forbidden to furnish the Saracens with arms or lumber for ships, under pain of a fine of 100 gold lire. Ash-wood, cotton, and dishes were sold in Syria and Africa, however—an indication of the continuous intercourse between those countries and Venice.

II.—CLIMATIC INOCULATION.

Climatic conditions also contributed considerably to the greatness of Venice. The Venetians—formerly dwellers on the mainland, and many of them mountaineers—came to live on coasts and islands: they fled before the Marcomanni, the Quadi, the Goths, the Huns, and the Franks. Until the invasions of the two last-named peoples, the Venetians frequently returned to their original home. When, however, the Longobardians had pursued them to their very islands, the Venetians definitely quitted the mainland. They completely changed their habits and occupations; from field-laborers and horsemen becoming at once fishermen and sailors. In short, they passed through what I should designate as a “climatic inoculation,” *i.e.*, a transformation due to a change of climate, but more particularly of occupation. This change of occupation is extremely useful to a people; impressing on them entirely new characteristics. Indeed, there are instances where the character of a people has been completely changed in this way, as, for example, in the case of the Hebrew race, which, although never crossed by other nations, has yet, owing to change of climate and occupation, become an entirely new people; differing entirely from its forefathers, and endowed with progressive ideas such as the ancient Jews never possessed.

III.—SELECTION, AND THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE.

Another cause of the wonderful growth of Venice was the selection which took place in consequence of the various migrations, in which only the most crafty and the most skilful could survive. Obligated, as

they were, to live on desert islands,—at one time cruising about, at another engaged in the salt-works,—only the most vigorous remained to carry on the struggle for existence. This struggle went on through the successive invasions which kept these islanders in continual danger, never-ceasing motion, and perpetual apprehension. How many times did the exiles have to change their capital! From Rialto, necessarily to Grado, Albiola, Torcello, Heraclea, Malamocco, and, finally, to Venice. Moreover, there were the internal struggles by which Italy was continually agitated during the Middle Ages. Also the frequent encounters between the partisans of the Franks, Goths, Longobardians, and Greeks, in which we may trace a faint resemblance to the struggles between the Guelphs and the Ghibellines on the Continent.

The greatest source of trouble, however, was the struggle against the sea. Even in the days of Rome, the Venetians began to drive piles and to make dikes against its invasions; and they also constructed bridges to connect the islands. About A.D. 600 they invented a new system of water-supply, the famous "Venetian wells"; and these have lasted to the present day. "The nature of the soil," writes Romanin, "necessitated a new system of hydraulics, and new methods of building embankments, canals, and dikes"; while the constant danger of attack made new methods of fortification for the canals themselves imperative. These things made Venice famous, even from the eighth century. The magistrates gave much attention to the drying of the soil; and from the time of Cassiodorus, the Venetians were known as the most skilful mariners.

During this long struggle it was inevitable that the Venetians should lose all the qualities least needful to their preservation, and that only the most robust and the most prudent should be developed. Hence that profound wisdom which characterizes the Venetian Government from its very beginning, and which seems to me greater than even that of Rome; for, while in Rome force often supplied prudence, in Venice prudence supplied force.

IV.—COMMERCE AND WEALTH.

It was by reason of this energy and prudence that the fishermen and salt-miners of Venice became great merchants. Their experience of many years had made seamen of them. At first, they cruised along the coasts and rivers of their native land, and acquired their first gains in this way; and so they penetrated by the Po into Ferrara, by the Piave into Belluno, by the Brenta into Padua. Gradually, however, they pushed farther on into Croatia, Sicily, Dalmatia, and eventually reached

India, Egypt, and even Siam. At first they sold salt and salted fish; then cloth, chests, bowls, and lumber; then, little by little, they extended their traffic until they became the purveyors of the drugs of India, the gold fabrics of Constantinople, and the slaves of the Saracens. They were in touch with the nations of Eastern Africa at a time when Europe generally was unknown in that part of the earth. Mercantile skill, prudence, and wisdom, valuable attributes at all times, were especially so at a period when all daring belonged to war, and when the art of trading only survived among a few persecuted and despised Hebrews and among the usurers of Lombardy. In A.D. 1200 Venice had a "Bureau for the Administration of Trade"; and even at that early period she was demonstrating the utility of free exchange. From 1336 there existed in Venice a true national bank or "Chamber of Loans." This bank supported the cultivation of olives in Cyprus, provided for the improvement of waste lands, gave special grants in Belluno for metal-founding, in Brescia for cloths, in Cyprus for mining, conceded to a certain Lapidida the contract for the Dalmatian alabaster, and bestowed certain privileges for a period of ten years to inventors of machines; thus displaying a fervor for progressive ideas such as is found, at present, only in America.

Owing to the religious and political liberty enjoyed at Venice, many heretics and rebels established themselves in that province, as in 1328, when the fugitives of Lucca, fleeing from the tyranny of Castruccio, introduced the manufacture of silk stuffs, etc. Printing and numerous other inventions were also introduced in this way. The Venetians sent commercial agents, *consoli*, to establish agencies in Hungary, in Flanders, and even in Trebizonde. The Brothers Morosini alone had fifty commercial houses in Syria, with agents, factors, etc. This firm exported to Spain cloths, silver manufactures, velvets, new coins, and, alas! even false coins, and brought back tin, drugs, pearls, amber, as well as the pistachio and other nuts. Other houses bought sugar in the Levant in exchange for wool; they sold the sugar in Flanders; and, by these transactions, frequently quadrupled their capital in a single voyage.

This commercial activity resulted in immense wealth, more particularly after the year 1500, when the doges themselves were engaged in mercantile pursuits. Rents rose enormously. There were palaces with apartments renting at 800 sequins a year. A little room frequently cost 20 sequins a year; and tiny shops in the Rialto paid an annual rent of 100 ducats (1,300–1,800 lire). In a tax-book for 1357 the houses in

Venice are appraised at 2,882,818 ducats. The National Bank of Venice, the first in Europe, had, in 1386, a capital of 246,390 ducats; and foreigners competed for the privilege of investing in it. From a speech of the Doge Mocenigo, at the early part of the fifteenth century, it appears that the annual sales of Venice in Lombardy alone were as follows: Woollen cloths, 400,000 ducats; linen, 10,000; Spanish wool, 240,000; cotton, 250,000; thread, 30,000; gold and silk cloth, 250,000; soap, 250,000; spices and colonial goods, 549,000; dyes, 120,000 ducats.

Here we have sales amounting to more than two millions of ducats; the dyers, weighers, packers, and sailors making a profit of half a million ducats from this commerce. From 1420 to 1450 Venice had thirteen hundred ships. At the Fair of the Ascension, which lasted fifteen days, the inns could not accommodate all the visitors; many being compelled to find quarters in private families.

V.—THE FORMATIVE PERIOD.

Neither the Græco-Slavonic mixture nor the selective process engendered by her long struggle for existence would have been of avail to Venice, had not these conditions existed from the first, at the very infancy of this new people. This combination of circumstances, in an ethnological sense, corresponds to the *stato nascente* of vegetable chemistry, in which an old shoot, grafted on a new one, becomes more fruitful than either of the two plants would have been alone. In my "Delitto politico" I have shown what a wonderful effect this state has on the condition of a people. "Locality," writes Spencer, "has the greatest influence in the beginnings of civilization." This is the reason why Florence, despite her advantageous position and her very clever race, no longer produces such splendid types as formerly. This is also the reason why religion, although in former times it had such enormous power, has now so little influence on civilization. The race-graft produced in Poland an extraordinary evolution, which disappeared entirely after its first action was over.

VI.—FREEDOM.

The greatest factor of Venetian progress, however, was the high degree of freedom—at times almost anarchical—by which the government of the islands was characterized. Many historians incline to the opposite opinion, because of the close, intolerant oligarchy of the past four cen-

turies, which, being nearer to us, impress themselves more strongly. These historians overlook the fact that the visible, dazzling splendor of despotic governments is only the last result,—the echo, as it were, of the true greatness attained under free government. This was as true in the days of Venice as it was in the age of Pericles or of Augustus: freedom in Venice began with the origin of the city, with the gathering, almost without organization, of the refugees from the Continent. True, not a few of the exiles were wealthy, and brought with them their dependents, workmen, etc.; but their authority over these was limited. Under Prætorian and barbaric influences the powerful structure of aristocracy had vanished from the Roman Empire; so that the tendency, outside the army, was toward equality. Furthermore, the only sources of gain in the islands of Venice were the salt-works and maritime pursuits; and as the rich were dependent upon the laborer, the condition of the latter became greatly improved. "The poor and the rich," wrote Cassiodorus, "are equal, and eat the same food. The only resources they have are the salt-works and their boats."

It would be difficult to find anywhere a more democratic government than that which for ten centuries prevailed in Venice. From the year 432, *i.e.*, after the invasion of the Goths and Huns, the islands, where Venice was to be, began to be populated. Each of these islands elected for the common defence a "Tribune," to administer justice and to superintend public affairs; the office lasting one year. The tribune was responsible to a General Council of the twelve islands or provinces, which Council held the true sovereignty. The Tribunes of the Islands had for a centre, rather than for a capital, Grado. This continued for one hundred and fifty years. After A.D. 657, during the new invasions of the Longobardians and the Franks, when Malamocco and Grado were taken, the Venetians found it advisable to choose an official head of the government. Thus arose the office of the Doge, who was elected by popular suffrage. So late as 1071 the election of the Doge Selvo was by an assembly of the common people, held on the shore of the Lido. In this way also Contarini was chosen in 1069. In questions of greater importance, the people, summoned by a bell, congregated in the open space before the Cathedral, rank by rank, and decided as to the sovereign power. In 1127 we hear for the first time of representative suffrage. Each quarter nominated two Electors; these, collectively, nominated forty-seven Grand Electors and these, again, sixty Senators. After the year 1168 the doge was chosen in this way. In appearance, however, his election was based on the popular vote; for even as late as 1192 the

doge, as soon as selected, had to pass through the Piazza St. Mark to receive the public approval of his nomination. Whenever the doges were inclined to tyrannize they were forced to abdicate; being blinded, banished, or killed. When, in 755, Gallia, blinding his predecessor, usurped the power, he, in spite of all his efforts to have his nomination confirmed by the people, was assaulted and finally driven away. Not one moment of true feudal dominion did Venice endure; her palaces or castles were never fortified, as those of Verona, Florence, and Rome; nor did she ever make appeal to judgment by ordeal or single combat. She always had a real form of judicial procedure, conducted partly by her tribunes and partly by so-called "Judges of the Palace." Even the nominations of the priests and bishops were made by the people, who also took the liberty of removing those functionaries whenever they became unpopular. Religious independence lasted for a long time in the Republic, which, in this respect, was like an oasis in the midst of the Latin desert. Here heretics and Jews always enjoyed special protection; and when Venice was forced to accept the Inquisition, she limited it, placing it under the presidency of the doge and of the Council of Ten. In this way the Inquisition was for many years restrained in Venice by the popular judgment, which did not share the devilish fanaticism of the Inquisitors.

Little by little, after 1300, popular suffrage was abolished, until, after the closing of the Grand Council in 1310, it was entirely obliterated. As we shall see, however, all this happened without excesses. The populace was deprived of universal suffrage, successively by the establishment of the Greater Council in 1172; by the election of the doges by four or five successive stages; by the election of the magistrates; by complete exclusion from the Grand Council; and by the more infrequent convocation of the popular assembly, or *Arrengo*. In 1423, the latter also was abolished, it having been enacted that the decisions of the Greater Council had no need of popular approval. Finally, in 1472, even the *forms* of popular government were taken away; and in 1618 the aristocracy claimed all offices, even those of the cities and provinces. But, though this oligarchical transformation was gradual, it was not without grave popular reactions, such as the conspiracy of Bocconio in 1299, of Baiamonte Tiepolo, and of Faliero. A certain respect for the people always existed, even during the oligarchical *régime* in Venice; and in 1300, a year so fatal to democracy, three officers were appointed to protect the interests of the people; while in 1363-68 the *Giustizieri* were elected to supervise all contracts made for children working in factories,

and to see that they were well treated—a thing that our present liberal Italian Government has not yet done.

There were ordinances also against the sellers of bad grain,—ordinances such as have never been adopted by what is called “Liberal Italy.” Even the hours of labor were limited, never exceeding nine in winter; and these hours were announced by the great bell of the Rialto. Convents were urged to pay taxes on their property; individuals were persuaded to enrich their land; and it was forbidden to take domestic cattle in pledge.

In 1317 provision was made as to guides for strangers in the city; and in 1537 an Advocate for the Poor was appointed. Penal questions were settled by a majority vote after argument. There were purveyors of food, supervisors of health, and disinfectors of rags. Too great an interference on the part of the doge was prevented after the year 1200 by the so-called “*Correttori della promission ducale*.” Upon the death of every doge these *Correttori* sat in judgment upon his acts, and proposed remedies for obnoxious laws. In this way the power of the doge became more and more limited.

On the mainland the municipal government was still democratic, as it had been in Venice at the time of the Great Council. Bergamo elected a Council of ninety-two who governed the city; remaining in office thirty-two months. Two “Defenders,” or tribunes, were appointed to protect the interests of the people; while two other citizens were selected to pass judgment upon the various officials after their retirement.

Municipal government gradually became aristocratic, however; and this transformation, although slow, could not fail to stir up violent reactions. It engendered warlike ideas of conquest, which endangered the interests of the common people, and diverted the Government from its true aim, that of increasing commerce; involving it in continual struggles on the mainland against the Lombards, Franks, and Hungarians,—struggles waged with the help of mercenaries and faithless allies. Thus was prepared the downfall of the Republic.

The closing of the Grand Council (A.D. 1310) is contemporaneous with the war with Padua; and the closing of the Arrengo, with the great wars of the Foscari. It is noteworthy that the first attempt at tyranny by Candiano IV (A.D. 976) is associated with the increase of the army and attempts at conquest. The people, however, were not deceived by these attempts; for they killed Candiano, burned his palace, and threw his corpse into the slaughter-house. Upon the whole, it may be said that the decadence of Venice was owing to the loss of liberty; the attention

of the people being diverted by foreign conquest, and this at a time when the great geographical discoveries endangered the monopoly of Asiatic and African commerce, which Venice had hitherto enjoyed. Romanin justly says:

"It was not the discovery of America that caused the decay of Venice: it only marked and aggravated it. The cause of the decay was in the proportion, always increasing, of its conquests on the mainland."

Venice was withdrawn from sea and entangled in the vicissitudes of war; expending enormous sums, and ever forcing new taxes upon the people. Hence those grinding imposts, that extended even to dresses of the women and door-locks of the peasants. In consequence of these exactions, the peasants of Venice, like those of Turkey to-day, abandoned their fields. In this way the population was diminished by 80,000 souls in the year 1590 alone. Continuous and fruitless struggles, not only with the Turks and the Moors, but with Spain, Florence, and the Pope, were followed, first, by coalitions with the great Powers, then by defeats, and, finally, by an uncertain and contradictory policy which made Venice suspected by all. As a result of these circumstances, the great wealth of Venice gradually disappeared.

At the opening of the fourteenth century the true condition of affairs was not yet manifest, because of the vast amount of hoarded riches. At the beginning of the fifteenth century, however, the symptoms were unmistakable. There were at the Arsenal, instead of 1,000 intelligent workmen, only 450 ignorant apprentices. With the loss of prosperity, wealth, and mutual confidence, freedom also disappeared; and when, at last, the Holy Office obtained complete control, every vestige of municipal liberty was lost, and there succeeded an oligarchical tyranny as severe and suspicious as a monarchy.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS:

NAPLES, RAVENNA, AMALFI, GENOA, FLORENCE, AND VENICE.

In order that the reader may grasp the full scope of my deductions, I would remind him of the fact that in ethnology and sociology, as in biology, causes are frequently numerous and complex. Thus, wealth springs from trade; trade is partly the fruit of freedom; and higher culture comes now from the one, now from the other, of these influences. Freedom increases the means of culture and wealth; favoring exchange, facilitating the arrival of persecuted foreigners, and in this way frequently introducing new forms of industry, as in Venice, Flanders, and Switzerland. The means of culture are introduced, in their turn, by commerce,

by reason of the facilities it affords for the dissemination of knowledge; and growing commerce, in its turn, increases wealth. If we contemplate all these influences as acting together, we shall begin to understand the true cause of Venetian greatness; for, while one or another of these causes may be seen operating singly in other parts of Italy,—as in Naples and Calabria,—in Venice we find them all combined. The mixtures with the Greeks, the Longobardians, and the Goths also existed in Calabria, where, for many centuries, all laws and public records were written in Greek. Here also, excellent physical conditions prevailed; while the sea furnished means of communication. But Naples did not receive the graft in its budding stage: her freedom was intermittent; and she achieved greatness in music and philosophy only.

Ravenna, a still stronger example, was compelled at first to struggle against the sea, and, like Venice, was built on piles. Ravenna also could boast of a mixture of races; for, according to Strabo, it was at first a colony of the Thessalians, then of the Sabines, then of the Romans. The Goths captured it in 493, and held it until 553, when it became subject to the Greeks, in whose hands it remained for a period of one hundred and eighty-five years. Then the Longobardians held it for thirty-one years, when it was given by the Emperor Charlemagne to the Pope. After that, it was governed by the Archbishop with the aid of three tribunes chosen from the people, and thus became a kind of republic. From 920 until about 1400, it was ruled by dukes and tyrants. It had a spacious harbor; and there could have been no lack of commerce. Wealth therefore was not wanting; nor were the struggles requisite to the development of power. Yet all these causes did not act together; nor were they present in the formative stage, as in Venice. In Venice moreover, the mixtures were tempered; while in Ravenna they were excessive. The too extensive Greek infiltration may have brought wealth and good taste; but at the same time it gave rise to effeminacy and a spirit of servility. We should remember, also, that when Ravenna might have made rapid strides forward, like Pisa and Genoa, she found in Venice a rival that throttled her.

The same may be said of Amalfi. In the tenth century that city carried on a considerable trade with the East. She had an excellent position on the coast, and was not, therefore, like her neighbors, compelled to acquire energy by fighting against the sea. Here, however, the mixture of foreign blood was not considerable; and the span of freedom was very short. There was also less fighting to do, and this only with the Saracens and the Longobardians.

Genoa and the Ligurians, too, had to contend against difficulties; yet their period of independence was very brief. At first they became slaves of the Romans, then of the Goths, and at last of the Franks; and it was only after 850,—more particularly from 1015 to 1050—that they could boast of any independence. In 1087 they were allies of the Pisans against the Moors. From 958 to 1100 they had indeed a free form of government, which consisted of a kind of tribal system; eight tribes being under one consul, as at Venice. But with commercial prosperity and triumph in war came loss of liberty. Compelled to give up their possessions in Greece and in Asia, and engaged in wars with Pisa and Venice, their attention was diverted from the maintenance of their liberty at home. Discords between the aristocratic Dorias and the Spinolas broke out; and the inhabitants took sides now with one faction, now with another. The people were represented by *podestas*, captains, and abbots, and finally by doges; but changes of title did not prevent their subjection to the nobility, who arrogated to themselves all the offices—offices originally devised as safeguards of liberty. Finally, foreigners, such as Henri IV, Robert of Naples, the Visconti, the Sforzas, etc., were called in to settle existing differences. Conquest and war extinguished liberty; and the people were always ready to follow the first demagogue who suggested a diminution of taxes.

Of Florence almost the same story may be told. Up to 1050 the Florentines recognized as their rulers bishops and margraves; they saved all their anger for heretics; and did not trouble themselves about liberty. Florence was not really free until about the year 1200. She was almost the last of the Italian republics, and enjoyed far less freedom than any of her predecessors. When Venice was beginning to lose her freedom, that of Florence was complete. Like that of Genoa, it was dimmed and interrupted by struggles with the feudal nobles,—almost all Germans,—who, from their castles, first hindered trade in the roads and then came into the city; menacing peace and liberty. The artizans and the peasants never had any real power. The chief sources of Florentine greatness, therefore, were native talent and an enterprising commercial spirit. This spirit, which revealed itself in the invention of bills of exchange, opposed the feudal customs that stood in its way, and became the prime factor in Florentine opulence.

Another source of Florentine greatness was the crossing with the Germans; for all the lords of the country, the Guidi, Uberti, Alberti, etc., who had come with their followers, were of Germanic stock. Tuscany had been swept clean by the Romans, and afterward by the Goths.

In speaking of this province, Perrens, in his "*Histoire de Florence*," records that "in many places not a man is to be seen." Tuscany, therefore, had to be repopled; more especially as it lay on the road to Rome. Here, then, we have a mixture of races, combined with liberty, and this during the formative period and among a people possessing natural talents and favored by physical conditions. Furthermore, there were the party struggles, which brought into play all the talents of the people. These conditions explain the greatness of Venice during the era of liberty—1200–1400. They were not conducive to political power, however; for the elements of prudence, energy, and perseverance were missing.

Venice eclipsed all these cities, because she united in her formative period all the necessary conditions which the other great centres of civilization possessed only separately. She was forced at the very outset to develop more energy in her struggle for existence, and also enjoyed a longer period of liberty.

Similar causes—liberty and the struggle against the sea—contributed to the greatness of still another people, a people otherwise not highly gifted, viz., the Low Germans and the Batavians. The original inhabitants of Holland certainly had not displayed great energy, nor an extraordinary love of liberty: they acquired these characteristics in their conflicts with the sea. By an inundation which took place in that country during the fifteenth century, sixty-two villages were destroyed and one hundred thousand persons drowned. From 1540 to 1648 twenty-five thousand hectares of this land were reclaimed from the ocean and cultivated. It is not astonishing that, amid such conditions, the Batavians, who originally lived in a low plain (a condition very unfavorable to development), should, eventually, have been transformed into a free nation.¹ At a time when the fashion for freedom was almost unknown in Europe, the people of Holland fought fiercely for their liberties against the aggressions of Spain and the tyranny of the Duke of Alva. Now when we consider, in this connection, that Venice enjoyed a longer period of freedom than any other nation of Europe,—eight hundred years,—we can understand why she surpassed all others in political greatness.

From all this it is easy to understand why government by the many, even though almost anarchical, should call into exercise all the talents, and afford opportunities for great men. From the time of the Tarquins, tyranny has always opposed, persecuted, and suppressed all individual greatness; and it is easier for art, politics, and science to prosper under a period of anarchy—when not too long—than under a tyranny or an

¹ I have elsewhere shown that great despotisms usually arise on great plains.

oligarchy, even though inspired for some time by a man of genius. Who would compare the art and the scientific works of Paris during the Napoleonic Empire to those of Athens or Florence in their anarchical times? Thus we can understand the somewhat puzzling phenomenon of the greatness of Florence as compared with that of Naples and Palermo, where we find no trace of any great work of art, and where all the great geniuses together do not rise to the Tuscan level.

Of course, as I have shown elsewhere, it is probable that geniuses are born in all countries. Frequently, however, their anomalous and unusual characters prevent recognition; and therefore they do not come to the front. Notwithstanding these conditions, it must be admitted that in democratic governments, where the ferment of freedom creates tolerance for new things, men of genius make their way much more easily, and readily find their proper spheres of usefulness; while applause rewards them and encourages them to new labors. In oligarchies or monarchies, on the other hand, everything tends to military glory, and all achievements redound to the honor of the chief, who thus maintains his *prestige*, and diverts the attention of the people from more useful aims. Hence the immense difference between the two great countries, the United States and Russia, both of which are progressive. Yet men of genius, who are thrown into prison in the latter, are in the former held worthy of the highest honors. Geniuses frequently arise in Italy; but, not being understood by the people, they disappear without leaving a trace,—unless, perhaps, free America adopts their inventions. Students of criminal anthropology are likewise repulsed by the authorities; and, if they do develop, it is because they receive the encouragement of more liberal countries. Sanarelli, who discovered the serum used against yellow fever, found only in the South American republics that recognition which was withheld in his own land.

In view of these facts, we may already catch a glimpse of the day when New York, so great a centre of commerce, liberty, wealth, and science, shall concentrate within herself, as once before did Venice, the true power of the world—the power of progress.

The principles involved in this article are applicable to the dangers now besetting the United States; and in view of my affection and admiration for that great country—a veritable paradise in the minds of thinking men of old Latin Europe—I cannot refrain from stating a few ideas which, in this connection, suggest themselves to me.

Those who have read the preceding pages will be convinced that the greatness of the Venetian States must be attributed primarily to the

liberty they enjoyed, and that the decline of their liberty was brought about chiefly by conquests in distant lands—conquests entailing tremendous expenses, hateful taxes, enormous armaments, and the surrender of the supreme power into the hands of men who ended in tyrannizing over them and in completely suppressing their liberty.

The latter purpose was the more readily accomplished because the masses, who were always inclined to war, were suffering from the complacency of vanity resulting from the glory of victories and conquests, and were therefore rendered less sensible to the gradual loss of freedom. The country being exposed to invasions by hostile forces, the suppression of liberty became a necessity; which suppression, though temporary, yet accustomed men to the idea of dictatorship.

Conquests, it is true, afforded a temporary wealth, and were fascinating to the people; but this wealth exhausted itself by its own excesses tending toward idleness and irremediable poverty. To the populace, conquest is fascinating; it is a drink which exhilarates. But precisely because it exhilarates the people, it intoxicates them, rendering them always ready to commit new blunders and quick to take offence; thus urging them on to foolish and shameful wars, in some one of which they finally lose their *prestige*.

Let the citizens of the United States carefully consider these facts before drinking the intoxicating, but poisonous, cup of conquest. Let them remember that the greatness of their country lies in its perfect independence of the rest of the world; that, once embroiled outside of America, it will, at the very least, obligate itself to alliances which will bring in their train formidable masses of adversaries. Let them bear in mind that there is nothing more dangerous for a nation founded on popular suffrage than to enter upon the descent toward war, down which declivity the popular instincts of all countries push and slip, in spite of the most powerful restraints. The breaking through of these restraints is, alas! fraught with the most imminent danger to America's greatest blessing, which is liberty, and the richest fruit of liberty—the absence of every form of militarism. Let them beware of militarism; for this is the source of all the evils that are ruining our Latin races.

C. LOMBROSO.

CYRANO DE BERGERAC.

LESS than a year ago the name of Edmond Rostand was hardly known outside of France, and not widely known there. Now he is one of the most famous of living dramatic poets; and the name of Cyrano de Bergerac, the "knight of the nose," the hero of his latest drama, is on the lips of theatregoers the civilized world over. Truly it was fame at a bound. "La Samaritaine," "Les Romanesques,"—they were good spring-boards. But Cyrano is a better one; and the leap is a *fait accompli*.

But another has shared in Rostand's fame. Cyrano de Bergerac—I mean the Cyrano of history—has also been "made," or shall I say remade? For he was one of those paradoxes, a practically unknown historical character, whom the encyclopædias summed up in a few lines, hardly as long as his nose.

Let us inquire for a moment who the real Cyrano was, and what in the way of historical material Rostand had to work upon. Fortunately, the latter was very scant. I say fortunately, because it gave the dramatic poet unhampered opportunity to deck his hero out with qualities that would make him dramatically interesting and effective. One thing about Cyrano is very certain; viz., he had a nose. But that it was the next largest peak to the Himalayas, as some more or less imaginative writers concerning him have playfully asserted, may be doubted. He was baptized in 1619 and died in 1655; and during his ebullient life he did several things which M. Rostand has cleverly utilized in his play. He was both a poet and a soldier; he wrote satiric verses and plays, from at least one of which Molière cribbed the scene beginning: "Que diable allait-il faire dans cette galère?" in his "Les Fourberies de Scapin." He also wrote a "Comic History of the States and Empires of the Moon," passages in which are said to have suggested to Swift the writing of "Gulliver's Travels."

Like the hero of the play, Cyrano was a Gascon Cadet of the company of Carbon de Castel-Jaloux; was wounded at the siege of Arras; and, according to eye-witnesses, put to flight, single-handed, a hundred men. He was killed, as in the play, by a log of wood being dropped

on his head; and his hours of death were eased by visits from his aunt, who was a prioress of the Convent of Daughters of the Cross, and by the gracious offices of Madeleine Robineau, widow of the Baron de Neuville—circumstances which will certainly interest those who know how finely Rostand has utilized these mere suggestions.

But, undoubtedly, what most struck M. Rostand about Cyrano was the large nose. Without that proboscis our author would probably never have thought of setting himself the task of constructing a play the reader and hearer of which would be brought to love a grotesque and ugly individual. Fantastic as the statement may seem, M. Rostand has really written his play with Cyrano's nose.

It is within bounds to say that he has given us one of the greatest plays, if not the greatest play, of the latter half of this century. Certainly nothing like the excitement created by it in dramatic and literary circles has been seen in France since Victor Hugo produced "Hernani" and bowled over the three unities of the classic drama as if they were so many ten-pins.

Numerous pæans have been sung in M. Rostand's praise by French critics; but, of all that has been said of him, I value most the opinion of the actor who created the rôle of *Cyrano* at the Porte St. Martin, Paris, December 28, 1897. Who should be better able than a distinguished actor—in this instance the most distinguished representative of the French stage—to deliver an opinion upon the qualifications of the author whose work he has interpreted so successfully?

Shortly after the production of "Cyrano," M. Coquelin wrote:

"I have seen him [M. Rostand] live, that is to say, I have seen him work seven or eight months; and I have never seen anything like it. He presents the most wonderful ensemble of *qualités de théâtre* which it is possible to conceive. This young man has everything and knows everything. I do not believe there exists a piece more effectively composed than 'Cyrano.'

M. Rostand is as great in placing his work in scene as he was in creating it. He sees everything; he pays attention to everything; he is incapable of neglecting the slightest detail; and no person could play *Cyrano* better than he. He has all the artifices of diction,—he has these with all the points of finesse, delicacy, and profundity of thought in expression.

He is a painter and a musician: he is a complete artist. To work with him is an enchantment. Need I say anything about him as a poet? He has in him all that is best in classic art, in romantic art, and in modern French art; and his tastes have all the *hauteur* of his talent. Here you have a little of what I think of him. It is as nothing compared with my full recognition of him; for I have as high an opinion of him as he has a right to have himself."

This is a striking tribute from an actor to his author, but no more

striking or charming than that which the author paid to his actor in the dedication of "Cyrano":

"It is to the soul of Cyrano I would dedicate this poem ;
But since that soul has passed into you, Coquelin, to you I dedicate it."

But now for the piece itself. No one can read it, much less witness the finely tempered representation of it given by Mr. Richard Mansfield, the creator of *Cyrano* in English, without understanding at a single reading or a single hearing why it fairly flashed upon the world. Even when merely reading the printed page the stage-craft stands out so vividly that one seems to see the action transpiring before one's very eyes; while in watching the performance, the literary charm of the lines is, in such episodes as the balcony scene, wafted from the stage like the odor of violets. We have plays of action and plays of character-study; but here is one in which adventure, romance, and character-development combine with the highest literary qualities to make a play whose hero alternately amuses us with his fantastic conceits, charms us with his poetic feeling, moves us to admiration by his valor, and appeals to our deepest emotions through a self-sacrifice as pathetic as it is beautiful.

With rare dramatic instinct, M. Rostand works out these qualities in graded succession—amusing us, charming us, and thrilling us in the order named, and in the end moving the more sympathetic of us to tears. It is this admirable blending of humor and pathos, this laughter-and-tears quality of the drama, which give it its hold upon the entire audience. Yet it is all done according to the highest canons of French literary art,—the lines of the original are Alexandrines;—so that, full of action as the piece is, it never descends to melodrama, and, though the adventure and romantic portions interest and stir us, we never lose sight of the leading character, so very complex yet so very simple because, withal, human. What that character means can best be brought out in a running commentary on the principal scenes in the play.

The first act opens in the hall of the Hôtel de Bourgogne in 1640, where a theatrical performance is about to begin. The real stage represents the auditorium; the mimic stage being set up to the left. The audience is gathering. A most life-like picture of the period is presented in this scene, which is enlivened by numerous incidental episodes, as, for instance, that in which a party of brisk young pages angle from the gallery, with a thread and pin, for an old fellow's wig; finally

hooking it and drawing it up amid screams of laughter. The characteristics of each group in the audience are admirably drawn. One hears, too, some talk of *Cyrano* and of his grotesque nose, and of his propensity to fight a duel with any man who comments upon it.

Cyrano's entrance is capitally managed. The curtain on the mimic stage has gone up, and a fat actor, named *Montfleury*, has come forward to the tallow foot-lights and begun his mouthing speech. The artistic sense of *Cyrano*—*Cyrano*, roysterer, Gascon Cadet, duellist, and poet—has been outraged by *Montfleury's* poor acting. Moreover, the actor has dared to ogle at the fair *Roxane*; and *Cyrano* has forbidden his appearance for a month. *Montfleury* has hardly spoken a few lines before one hears *Cyrano's* voice bidding him retire. There is a protest from the audience, who wish the play to go on. As the audience surges around *Cyrano*, still vehemently protesting against his interrupting the play, he challenges the whole pit collectively: "Let all who long for death hold up their hands!" There are a few more scattered protests; but *Montfleury*, choosing discretion as the better part of valor, disappears as through a trap.

This leads to one of the episodes and speeches of the play that have become famous. A certain *Viscount de Valvert*, taking offence at *Cyrano's* interruption of the performance, and at the same time desiring to display his own valor to the crowd, goes up to *Cyrano* and says: "Sir, your nose is . . . hm . . . it is . . . very big!" *Cyrano*, apparently unperturbed, takes the *Viscount* to task for not having displayed more originality in his remark. This is the famous speech of the nose. Had the *Viscount* desired to be descriptive he might, says *Cyrano*, have remarked:

"'Tis a rock! . . . a peak! . . . a cape!
—A cape, forsooth! 'Tis a peninsula!"¹

On the other hand, had the *Viscount* wished to be gracious, he might have said:

"You love the little birds, I think?
I see you've managed, with a fond research,
To find their tiny claws a roomy perch!"

Or he might have exclaimed with truculence:

"When you smoke your pipe . . . suppose
That the tobacco-smoke spouts from your nose,—
Do not the neighbors, as the fumes rise higher,
Cry, terror-struck: 'The chimney is afire'?"

¹ The quotations are from the translation by GLADYS THOMAS and MARY F. GUILLEMARD.

Or had the *Viscount* been capable of human tenderness, he might have expressed this caution concerning the nose:

"Pray get a small umbrella made,
Lest its bright color in the sun should fade!"

And so *Cyrano* runs the gamut through a speech of no less than fifty-four lines of such variety, and at the same time so capitally illustrating the cynicism and satirical acumen of his character, that the interest is sustained from beginning to end.

A duel ensues between the *Viscount* and *Cyrano*; the latter promising that he will compose a *ballade* while he fights and will "touch" the *Viscount* on the last line of the *envoi*. The duel begins; *Cyrano* parrying each thrust of his opponent, and at the same time improvising the three eight-lined stanzas of the *ballade*. Here is *Cyrano's envoi*:

"Prince, pray Heaven for your soul's weal!
I move a pace—lo, such! and such!
Cut over,—feint!"
(*Thrusting.*)
"What ho! You reel?"
(*The Viscount staggers. CYRANO salutes.*)
"At the *envoi's* end, I touch!"

Cyrano now has the whole mimic audience with him. Even the women in the boxes,—among them *Roxane*,—who were much chagrined at his interruption of the performance, have found the poetic duel far more interesting; and they applaud him loudly.

When the audience has dispersed, *Cyrano* confesses to his friend *Le Bret* that he is in love with *Roxane*, but that, on account of his grotesque nose, he can never hope to win her or any other woman. The lines are full of pathos:

"At times I'm weak: in evening hours dim
I enter some fair pleasaunce, perfumed sweet;
With my poor ugly devil of a nose
I scent spring's essence,—in the silver rays
I see some knight,—a lady on his arm,
And think, 'To saunter thus 'neath the moonshine,
I were fain to have my lady, too, beside!'
Thought soars to ecstasy . . . O sudden fall!
—The shadow of my profile on the wall!"

Le Bret, however, tells him that he saw *Roxane* herself deathly pale as she watched the duel; and when, a few minutes later, *Roxane's* duenna comes to *Cyrano* with the request that he appoint a meeting

with the fair lady for the morrow, he is inspired with the hope—alas! only too soon to be dashed to pieces—that, despite his grotesqueness, she may love him for his valor. The act ends with *Cyrano*, once more in his character of swashbuckler, going forth to fight single-handed one hundred men who, he learns, are lying in wait for one of his friends.

It would be profitable, if space permitted, to go into some detail concerning the earlier scenes of the second act, which are laid in *Ragueneau's* pastry-shop; but I can only touch upon them. *Ragueneau*, the poetic pastry-cook, who allows the poor poets to come and feast upon his dainties; *Lise*, his shrewish wife, who turns the manuscript pages of his own poems into paper bags for tarts and puffs,—these and other characters are capitally drawn; and the humor of the episodes lightens the action of the play.

It is here that *Cyrano* meets *Roxane*. The latter confesses to him that she is in love: and her description of her lover—as one who knows not that she is in love with him; as a poor youth who all this time has loved timidly from afar and dared not speak; and one who belongs to *Cyrano's* own regiment, is in fact a cadet in *Cyrano's* own company,—rouses in *Cyrano's* breast the hope that *Roxane* is confessing her love for himself. But as soon as she describes her lover as proud, noble, young, intrepid, *fair*—*Cyrano* knows at the word “fair” that *Roxane* is not for him. She has, in fact, come to beg him to exercise a kindly protection over her lover, *Christian de Neuville*.

Poor *Cyrano*! Not only can he not win the woman who is the consuming passion of his life, but he is asked to be a guardian to his rival. From this point begins the self-effacement of *Cyrano*. We have been amused by his grotesqueness, and moved to admiration by his valor. But now he begins to creep into our sympathy; for from now on he practises the self-sacrifice which grows more beautiful as the play proceeds, and fills us with love and pity for this strange creature until his very nose—which, by one of the strangest yet most admirable freaks of genius, Rostand has made the root-cause of all his hero's woes—becomes pathetic instead of grotesque. Were *Cyrano* a handsome man, his self-sacrifice would not arouse the pity it does. His very ugliness makes his self-sacrifice the more touching.

Occasionally, it is true, the old roysterer and swashbuckler in him break out again, as when he introduces the Cadets to *De Guiche* with the famous *chanson des Cadets de Gascogne*:

“The bold Cadets of Gascony,
Of Carbon of Castel-Jaloux!

Brawling and swaggering boastfully,
 The bold Cadets of Gascony!
 Spouting of armory, heraldry,
 Their veins a-brimming with blood so blue,
 The bold Cadets of Gascony,
 Of Carbon of Castel-Jaloux!"

But we are soon brought to the turning-point of the play, that wonderful conception of Rostand's which inspires *Cyrano*—when he discovers that *Christian*, though handsome, has not the wit by which *Roxane*, being a *précieuse* of the day, sets so much store—to write love-letters for *Christian* and to teach him love-speeches to address to her. In other words, the ugly *Cyrano* puts his own poetic soul into *Christian's* beautiful body; thus making him an ideal lover for a woman like *Roxane*, the while bearing his own suffering with a smile. It is quite impossible to follow out all the scenes in detail; but from this point on they are most skilfully contrived to emphasize *Cyrano's* love for *Roxane* and the pathos of his self-sacrifice.

These are beautifully set forth in the balcony scene of the third act. *Roxane* is leaning over the balcony; while *Christian* speaks to her words which *Cyrano* whispers to him. But *Christian* is not quick enough; and, when *Roxane*, leaning over the balcony, asks why he speaks so falteringly, *Cyrano* pushes him aside and, imitating *Christian's* voice, pours forth his own love for the fair lady. One impassioned phrase follows another; the scene reaching its climax when *Cyrano* asks her for a kiss and then stands aside while *Christian* climbs the lattice and receives it. The lines are charming:

"A kiss, when all is said,—what is it?
 An oath that's ratified,—a sealèd promise,
 A heart's avowal claiming confirmation,—
 A rose-dot on the 'i' of 'adoration,'—
 A secret that to mouth, not ear, is whispered,—
 Brush of a bee's wing, that makes time eternal,—
 Communion perfumed like the spring's wild flowers,—
 The heart's relieving in the heart's outbreathing,
 When to the lips the soul's flood rises, brimming!"

The line, "A rose-dot on the 'i' of 'adoration,'" has already become almost a familiar quotation. Pathetic are the words in which *Cyrano* expresses his own suffering, as *Roxane's* lips meet *Christian's*:

"Strange pain that wings my heart!
 The kiss, love's feast, so near! I, Lazarus,
 Lie at the gate in darkness."

Several humorous incidents are introduced in this act to relieve the

"sweetness long drawn out." The *Count de Guiche* is in love with *Roxane*; and, fearing an interruption from him, *Cyrano* stations a party of lute-players on the street nearby, with instructions to play a sad air if a man appears, but a merry tune for a woman. In the midst of the love-making the lutes are sounded. They play first sadly, then gayly. "What? Neither man nor woman?" queries *Cyrano*. "Oh, a monk!" This speech and the entrance of a friar immediately upon it never fail to raise a pleasant ripple of laughter.

The monk is, however, introduced for a further purpose: his coming has a direct bearing upon the action. He has a letter from *De Guiche* for *Roxane*. *Roxane*, by giving a false reading to it, makes the monk believe that it is a request from *De Guiche*, who is her guardian, that she marry *Christian* forthwith, because the Gascon Cadets are about to be ordered to the Spanish War; and the friar follows *Roxane* and *Christian* into the former's house, in order to perform the ceremony, while *Cyrano* remains outside, to detain *De Guiche* whose speedy coming the letter really announced.

The ensuing scene is one of the cleverest in the play. The night is dark, save for the faint illumination of the moon. *Cyrano* climbs upon the wall and, as *De Guiche* enters, suddenly drops from it and, with his cloak wrapped round him and crouching low, appears before the *Count* like a black spectre. He capers about, asking all kinds of unintelligible questions, until *De Guiche* exclaims: "He's raving mad!" *Cyrano*, constantly keeping between the *Count* and the house,—thus preventing the nobleman from entering,—plays the part of a sprite dropped from the moon. He feigns ignorance of where he is. He asks if it is Africa or Venice or Rome, until *De Guiche* tries to pass, with the impatient explanation, "A lady waits!" "Oho!" exclaims the moon sprite, "I am in Paris!" *Cyrano* keeps this up in an assumed voice; interesting *De Guiche*, in spite of himself, until there has been time enough for the ceremony to have been performed, when, dropping to his natural accents, he exclaims, to the *Count's* dismay:

"I'll hinder you no more:
The marriage-vows are made."

The act closes with a charming scene. Bear in mind that all *Christian's* love-letters have been written by *Cyrano*. They are obliged to hurry off to the war together. Distant drums are heard. *Roxane*, turning to *Cyrano*, begs him to promise that he will see that *Christian* does not risk his life; that her lover will be prudent; that he will not

catch cold; that he will be faithful. *Cyrano* shrugs his shoulders to all these requests. He will do his best, but promise?—that is another matter. *Roxane* has another request to make. "Promise that he will write oft!" "That," says *Cyrano*, who has written all the letters that have so charmed *Roxane*, "I promise you!"

This little turn at the end is so felicitous and, with all its humor, nevertheless throws again into such strong relief *Cyrano's* self-sacrificing nature, that, as the curtain goes down, the audience, not knowing whether to laugh or to wipe away a tear, simply applauds vigorously. *Cyrano* has completely won its sympathies: it now loves him.

The tumultuous fourth act, representing the siege of Arras and the almost complete annihilation of the Gascon Cadets, serves to bring out in still stronger relief *Cyrano's* self-sacrifice. Twice daily he risks death in stealing through the enemy's lines, in order to send to *Roxane* love-letters which he himself has written, but which are supposedly from *Christian*. In a very charming scene *Roxane* arrives at the camp of the Cadets; bringing them provisions and cheer at a time when they are sadly in need of them. She confesses to *Christian* that, while she at first loved him for his beauty, she now loves him for his soul, as shown in his letters. *Christian* immediately realizes that it must be *Cyrano* whom she loves, and charges the latter to explain the true situation to *Roxane*. *Cyrano* is almost on the point of doing so, when the enemy begins an attack, and *Christian* is killed at the first discharge of musketry. Then, rather than appear to slander a dead friend, *Cyrano* keeps the secret of their double wooing to himself.

Superb is the end of this act, when the Spaniards, coming in full view of the dead Cadets, *Cyrano*, standing erect amid a storm of bullets, and speaking as if he were introducing his slain comrades to the foe, rips out with:

"The bold Cadets of Gascony,
Of Carbon of Castle-Jaloux!"

and plunges into the thick of the fray.

In exquisite contrast to the storm and stress of this scene is the tranquil opening of the next and last act in the park of the Sisters of the Holy Cross in Paris. There, for fifteen years, *Roxane* has lived in retirement, mourning *Christian's* death; and thither every Saturday has come the faithful *Cyrano* to bring her the news of the outer world. She playfully dubs him her "Gazette." In the very last scene of all *Roxane* is finally brought to a realization that it was *Cyrano* who wrote

the beautiful letters which she had supposed were *Christian's*, and that it was he whose voice crept into her soul from under the balcony that moonlit night.

Cyrano's satirical verses have made him many enemies; and, a few steps from his house, as he is issuing forth to visit *Roxane*, someone lets fall a large piece of wood which, striking his head, wounds him mortally. Nevertheless, after having it bandaged, he covers the wound with his beaver as well as he can, and makes his way to *Roxane*. Weak though he is, he begins detailing his budget of news, and when he faints in the midst of it, attributes his faintness, after he has been brought to, to an old wound received at Arras.

This naturally leads to reminiscences; and *Roxane* gives him a letter to read,—a letter addressed to herself, and bearing stains of tears and blood, which she had found on *Christian's* body. It is one of *Cyrano's* own letters. He begins reading it aloud. After a while she looks up and notices that he is not reading, but reciting it, and that, though the shades of evening have darkened so that the written words are illegible, he still continues. At the closing words of the letter:

“Here, dying, and there, in the land on high,
I am he who loved, who loves you,—I . . .”

Roxane places her hand on *Cyrano's* shoulder, and, with a simplicity which adds to the pathos of the scene, says through the dusk:

“And, fourteen years long, he has played this part
Of the kind old friend who comes to laugh and chat!”

But something besides the love of *Roxane* has come to *Cyrano*. The chill of death is on his brow. *Roxane* may exclaim, “Live, for I love you!” but it is too late. The approach of death seems only to deepen the tenderness of *Cyrano's* love for *Roxane*. How exquisite are the lines in which he protests, when she exclaims, “I have marred your life—I, I!” Resting his eyes upon her he answers:

“You blessed my life!
Never on me had rested woman's love,
My mother even could not find me fair;
I had no sister; and, when grown a man,
I feared the mistress who would mock at me.
But I have had your friendship—grace to you,
A woman's charm has passed across my path.”

No critic, however keen, could analyze *Cyrano's* character more completely than Rostand himself has done by words which, in this

scene, he has put into his hero's mouth. They sum up the whole pathos of his self-sacrificing nature :

“Look you, it was my life
To be the prompter every one forgets!
That night when 'neath your window *Christian* spoke
—Under your balcony, you remember? Well!
There was the allegory of my whole life:
I, in the shadow, at the ladder's foot,
While others lightly mount to Love and Fame!”

As the end approaches, *Cyrano* once more pulls his failing forces together; and, starting up with the strength of one in delirium, cries out, “What ho! Cadets of Gascony!” Then, bracing himself against a tree, he faces death:

“It comes. E'en now my feet have turned to stone,
My hands are gloved with lead! But since Death comes,
I meet him still afoot, and sword in hand!
. . . Why, I well believe
He dares to mock my nose? Ho! insolent!
What say you? It is useless? Ay, I know!

You strip from me the laurel and the rose!
Take all! Despite you there is yet one thing
I hold against you all, and when, to-night,
I enter Christ's fair courts, and, lowly bowed,
Sweep with doffed casque the heavens' threshold blue,
One thing is left, that, void of stain or smutch,
I bear away despite you.

(*He springs forward, his sword raised; it falls from his hand; he staggers, and falls back into the arms of LE BRET and RAGUENAU.*)

ROXANE.

(*Bending over him and kissing his forehead.*)

'Tis? . . .

CYRANO.

(*Opening his eyes, recognizing her, and smiling.*)

My plume.”

And so, like a knight, *sans peur et sans reproche*, the honor and the faith which enabled him to sacrifice his own love for his dead friend and for the woman he worshipped still unsullied, he passes away.

Poor *Cyrano*!—“You strip from me the laurel and the rose”; but what death has taken away, has not a young French poet given back to you with a stroke of his pen? Your ashes, which, during the Reign of Terror, were taken from their resting-place and scattered, has not Rostand gathered them again and deposited them in an exquisite urn—the glory of the literary France of to-day? GUSTAV KOBBE.